

### *An Old and a New Analogy.*<sup>1</sup>

THE idea of adapting Butler's "Analogy of Religion" to modern requirements is a thought that readily suggests itself; and one author has lately acted upon the suggestion. What has been the success of his endeavour we will inquire presently. But before speaking of the New, it will be necessary for us to say a few words about the Old Analogy, in order to have before the mind what it was that had to be improved upon. For some generations past, the latter work had been held in veneration; the Church of England pointed with pride to the fact of such a book having issued from her own episcopate, one reply surely to the oft-repeated taunt, that the editing of a Greek tragedy was the ordinary advertisement of capability for ecclesiastical preferment. To study the Analogy was a portion of the higher educational course in this country; here was one substantial part of the philosophical and theological training that the University had to offer. As a consequence the English mind, whose peculiar bent first gave its direction to Butler's treatise, was by this same treatise still more confirmed in the old course. But now a generation—or at any rate, a class of men who claim to be, *par excellence*, the present generation—has risen up to say that the Analogy, being quite out of date, ought to be shelved *instantly*, at least as a class book for training the young intellect in the way it should go.

The radical fault found with Butler is the repudiation of a philosophy, and the falseness or the inadequacy of his philosophy so far as he does commit himself to any principles. "The essence of his method," says Mr. Leslie Stephen, "as of that of the common-sense school to whom he is most nearly related, was to pass by those ultimate problems which are strictly called philosophical. The attempt to frame a religious theory without thoroughly sounding its foundations led to the inevitable result." On this quotation it is to be remarked,

<sup>1</sup> *A New Analogy.* By Cellarius. London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.

that the more a man has experience of writing, the more he finds that he can do only one thing at a time. He must assume a certain position and treat his subject from that elevation; he cannot build every treatise up from the foundation, and add on to the sides every wing and buttress that may absolutely be required for completeness all round. So we cannot find fault with Butler simply because he does not begin *ab ovo*. But unfortunately, while actually and unskilfully meddling with the foundations of his structure, he has thereby positively weakened its chance of standing. "It is not my design," he writes, "to inquire into the nature, the foundation, and the measure of probability; or whence it proceeds that likeness should beget that presumption, opinion, and full conviction, which the human mind is formed to receive from it, and which it does necessarily produce in every one, or to guard against the errors to which reasoning from analogy is liable. This belongs to the subject of logic, and is part of that subject which has not as yet been thoroughly considered. Indeed, I shall not take upon me to say, how far the extent, compass, and force of analogical reasoning can be reduced to general rules, and the whole be formed into a system. But though so little in this way has been attempted by those who have treated of our intellectual powers, this does not hinder but that we may be, as we unquestionably are, assured that analogy is of weight, towards determining our judgment and practice. Nor does it in any wise cease to be of weight in those cases, because persons, either given to dispute, or who require things to be stated with greater exactness than our faculties appear to admit in practical matters, may find other cases in which it is not easy to say, whether it be or be not of any weight; or instances of seeming analogies, which are really of none. It is enough to the present purpose to observe that this general way of arguing is evidently natural, just, and conclusive." Now this passage, read in the light of many others which are to be found up and down the volume, raises a suspicion that Butler leaned to the common-sense philosophy, not only in its true statement that the mind can act correctly without having formed to itself a reflex system of its own laws, and, further, does often work the better the more direct and natural its process is; but in the untrue statement, that no philosophic theory of certitude is quite valid in the matter of religion. He so opposes practical to speculative conviction, that he appears in a lesser degree

to share the error which Hume exhibits in its worst form.<sup>2</sup> With Butler right conduct is so predominant, that, though guided in the main by right reason, its unreasoned instincts seem capable of supplying what may be deficient in the light of intelligence. Hence, in one place, he replies to a difficulty by going straight to the end he has in view, rather than by stopping to discuss the intermediate point which has been raised. "The design of the treatise," he insists, "is not to vindicate the character of God, but to show the obligations of man; it is not to justify His providence, but to show us what it belongs to us to do." Butler does not seem to have clearly marked out for himself the difference between the probability that so often serves to guide our worldly conduct, for instance, when with slight necessity we take the risks of a railway journey, and the absolute certainty which is required about the articles of our creed. A man cannot save his soul by saying, "I will live religiously, for it is in the highest degree likely that I shall thus be on the gaining side; and most assuredly I shall be on the safe side." Neither again does Butler appear to have nicely discriminated the instances in which we legitimately oppose truths of theory to truths of practice, namely, when theory puts a condition of things which in practice cannot be realized, such as the course of a cannon-ball *in vacuo*. Very different is Butler's case when he says, "it may possibly be disputed how far miracles can prove natural religion; and notably objections may be urged against this proof of it considered as a matter of speculation; but considered as a practical thing, there can be none." It is to be added, however, in defence of Butler, that he does at times speak as though he attributed to religion certitude in the complete sense of the term; and more especially, that he directs many of his arguments simply *ad hominem*. "In this treatise I have argued upon the principles of others, not my own, and have omitted what I think true and of the utmost importance, because by others thought unintelligible and

<sup>2</sup> Hume simply resigns himself to a complete division and discord between man practical and man speculative; and he says that the former must ever be acting as experience teaches, while the latter is ever condemning such action as logically unjustifiable. Professor Clifford also makes practice everything. "Any beginning of action is what we call a judgment. If you consider what a proposition means, you will see that it must correspond with the beginning of some sort of exertion. When you say that A is B, you mean that you are going to act as if A were B." Similarly Professor Bain makes readiness to act upon a judgment the criterion of certitude; a sportsman would say readiness to bet on the matter, which really is not a bad test of subjective conviction.

not true." The main caution for a Catholic reader of the Analogy is: do not get a false idea about the obscurity which all admit to surround articles of faith, and in part to give belief its merits; do not look upon the act of faith as a venture, made with a certain chance of failure.<sup>3</sup> You have first the motives of credibility for believing that God has revealed a determinate truth; and these, after all their evidences have been conscientiously weighed, are enough to produce natural certainty in their own sphere. Then you ascend to a higher order and elicit the act of faith, resting on God's authority alone, Who must know the truth and cannot speak against His better knowledge. This act is supernatural, and about it there clings an obscurity—*obscuritas revelantis*, affecting not only the mode of proposing the matter, but, generally at least, the matter proposed likewise.

There are two chief divisions in the Analogy. The first part, taking for granted an Author of nature, tries to defend natural religion on its analogy to the natural course of things as experienced by us. This portion of the work is admittedly weak, if judged by the standard of strict positive demonstration. Yet taking it for what it is, and not asking of it to do more than it can rightfully pretend to do, we must admit that it has its great utility. *De facto*, many difficulties are simple difficulties of imagination; men cannot picture a state of things, and therefore they are sceptical. Nay, even philosophers have been so bold as to say that *imageability* is the criterion of human certitude. Now those obstacles of mere conception, for example, as to life after death, may be largely removed by the analogy of changes already gone through, each man, after leaving the womb, having passed to the new conditions of infant existence, boyhood, adolescence, and maturity. The idea of the mind sometimes surviving the decrepitude of the body is an aid to the realization of the soul surviving the death of the body. Virtuous or vicious conduct, bringing often in this life its own reward or punishment, though not a direct proof that the same respective consequences will follow in another life upon the same action, yet is a consideration somewhat helpful towards a proof. Besides, these several instances are mere units in a

<sup>3</sup> The proposition is condemned by Innocent the Eleventh. "Assensus fidei supernaturalis et necessarius ad salutem stat cum notitia solum probabili revelationis, et cum formidine ne non sit locutus Deus." How, in the case of the uneducated, the motives of credibility are made known with sufficient cogency for a rational assent, is a question too long for a note.



large sum, the total amounting to this; the course seen to be pursued in the government of the world, is analogous to the course which natural religion teaches us will be pursued in another life; hence that religion at least has this in favour of its claims, that it is of a piece with what we all agree to be the work of the Author of nature. There is something in such an argument, if its premisses are admitted; and if the premisses are denied, the dispute must be carried elsewhere; for the Analogy does not profess to be complete as an apologetic treatise. *Valeat quantum valet.* Butler himself was fully aware of the inadequacy of his work; he was aware of what is called one of his capital oversights, namely, that he was arguing from instances in a world of experience to instances in a world of which we have no experience, and of which the very existence was in question. He tries to meet the objection. "It must be allowed just," he contends, "to join abstract reasoning with the observation of facts, and argue from such facts as are known to others that are like them; from that part of the Divine government over intelligent creatures under our view to that larger and more general government over them, which is beyond it; and from that which is present to collect that which it is *likely, credible*, or not *incredible*, will be hereafter." This is not the best expression of the state of the question, but its drift is pretty correct and may be interpreted as something of this sort: "You think that my personal consciousness will cease at death, because then you see the destruction of my body. Now you have no proof for your opinion, and I will show you a reason for suspecting the contrary. A largely prevalent system of belief, called natural religion, tells me that my existence will be prolonged beyond the grave, and that I shall then reap the fruits of my own deeds during life. That depends on the Author of nature and of me.<sup>4</sup> Knowing how He has arranged the course of my earthly existence, a future existence, according to the conditions just laid down, would be just what I might expect from Him. If such turned out to be the fact hereafter, I should be the opposite of surprised." A very incomplete argument to be sure, but one that has its use, and is as demonstrative, let us add, as Mr. Spencer's argument for a future optimism brought about by evolution; or Professor Tyndall's "leaning to the affirmative, that if a nebular mass were now set revolving in space it would ultimately develope

<sup>4</sup> Agnostics of course would dispute this idea of an Author of nature.

conscious life." Many of our modern "scientific beliefs," as distinguished from scientific certainties, are founded on analogies that are far from demonstrative; and why should not religion avail herself of analogies as secondary aids in the enforcement of those truths, of which on other and indubitable grounds she is firmly assured?

The second part of the Analogy is concerned with revealed religion: and this portion James Mill has pronounced conclusive against difficulties, on the plea of which deists stand back from Christianity. Nor is he alone in this admission. The author of the notorious *Système de la Nature* was of the same mind. For the deist, admitting a personal God, powerful and good, has to take, as satisfactory, the general replies which are given to difficulties about a mysterious providence, the existence of a spiritual soul, future life, and similar dark matters. Now, whoever can get over these obstacles has no logical right to refuse the evidences for Christianity. It is like a Protestant accepting the mystery of the Incarnation and the Redemption, but arguing against Transubstantiation simply on the ground of its incomprehensibility or improbability. "Man cannot make his God," as our Laureate has thought it worth while to say in his *Queen Mary*. The infidel author before referred to, Baron D'Holbach, makes this comparison of deism to Protestantism "Le théisme est par rapport à la superstition (le Christianisme) ce que la réforme ou le Protestantisme a été par rapport à la Religion romaine. Les réformateurs révoltés de quelques mystères, n'ont point contesté d'autres, qui n'étaient pas moins révoltants. Dès que l'on peut admettre le Dieu théologique, il n'est rien dans la nature qu'on ne puisse adopter." This is only an example of what may be generally observed, that when atheists speak against Christian Churches simply as institutions which they hate, they single out the Catholic Church as the most hateful, because uncompromisingly opposed to their principles; but when they compare Christian bodies together in point of consistency and of historic descent from the foundations of Christianity, their highest praise is for this same Catholic Church. We accept the attitude which they assume to us: it is just what we should expect, and, in the second particular, just what the Jewish body has said. Thus the argument in Butler's Analogy is valid, and goes a step further than he perceived.

If, then, Butler's work is effective against the deistic position, he was far from failing in that which he had principally in view.

For it was mainly against deism that he contended. It is quite touching to read the life of the honest, earnest man, so little given to ambition, leading a celibate life which his Church did not impose upon him, and devoting the whole of his energies, thus left free, to the cause of a faith which he lamented to see beset with numerous and loudly insulting enemies. But it is urged that the defence which availed against the shallow, half-measure deists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, is of no force against the thorough-going criticism of our age. Our first answer is, that Butler did well to consider chiefly the wants of his own age, which, by the way, was not so wholly inferior to ours, and from which the Tubingen school has consented to borrow some of its prime theories. Even though at that time the documents of revelation had already been assailed on historical and scientific grounds by Toland, Collins, Woolston, Morgan, and others, it did not enter within the scope of *Analogical* reasoning to reply to such attacks; but the Analogy did strike at the root of these objections when it tried to remove the prejudices which led to their being made at all. And this is the second reply on behalf of Butler's method of procedure. The historic value of Scripture and early Christian records is assailed, not because they have not the ordinary evidences of authenticity, for they have more than this, but because of preconceived ideas about the impossibility of miracles and prophecy and of a revealed dispensation. Butler's analogies are suited to dissipate many of these clouds, and that is sufficient justification of the book being what it is. A large number of objections to Christianity are, we must never forget, but sorry specimens of cogent reasoning: they are inferences from trifles. Hence they have to be met, or may profitably be met, on their own humble ground. It takes two good disputants to make a good discussion; so that where the assailant acts not as a very wise man, the defendant must in some degree act on the principle "of answering a fool according to his folly." There is no need to quote the maxim as a preface to the argument, because that would be offensive and only stand in the way of a good result; but all the same the uncomplimentary motto will secretly furnish the method of campaign.

Turning now to the New Analogy, it would be unfair of us to criticize the book as if it pretended to more completeness than it actually claims. We will try to estimate the work on

its own standard, and to do this all the more without any spirit of needless hostility, because the author seems thoroughly credible in his profession of wishing only to do good, of having no desire to intrude his own person upon public notice, and of desiring to avoid all offence. There is not a flavour of bitterness from beginning to end, not a sign of an attempt at vain, vapouring declamation without a purpose beyond display, though we shall have to accuse some parts of being fanciful. And yet we must say candidly, that there is much that we cannot accept about the work. The substance of our very wide disagreement may be put shortly. The writer, following, as he says, in the steps of Butler, wishes to defend the essence of Christianity, and for that end leaves out of consideration all that he considers to be ulterior developments. "Let us summarize the account which revelation gives us concerning God as involving this much at the very least: that the Creator of the world sent His Son to live a human life on it with the object of redeeming it from evil by sacrifice of Himself to death and resurrection to life, and that the Holy Spirit was sent to carry forward this work." He admits that there are, beyond these, other Christian truths on which he himself has fixed judgments, and which he highly values, but which it is convenient to leave out of the present account. Still he should keep these further propositions in view, in order that, while drawing out his analogies, he may make none of them conflict with what are undoubtedly matters of faith. In more instances than one he offends against this very obvious and very necessary rule. For example, any one who will read the New Testament with moderate attention will see, that neither Christ nor His Apostles contemplated the warring of sects as the directly intended and legitimate means of bringing out what was the genuine Christian doctrine. Yet our author makes it a capital point of analogy between Nature and Revelation, that, as natural science and the physical development of nature are wrought out by struggle and survival of a small chosen remnant, so the knowledge of revelation and the sanctification of Christian souls are wrought out by similar means. Here is a passage on the elimination of errors in belief. "The positive (or we might call them scientific) essentials of Christianity are contained in the life of Christ, but we arrive at this not at all by any immediate effort of the reasoning or spiritual faculties, much less as an expression of individual opinion, but by a long course of conflict, of survival, of rejecting

non-essentials, of discovering more clearly what it was that God did, or framed, or set in motion at the first beginning by the exercise of His sole power. And this is accomplished in a very remarkable way, being no other than through the agency of the various Christian sects or Churches, the very existence of which has constantly been alleged as an argument against the religion that produced them. It has always been felt as a stumbling-block that a religion, which assumes to inculcate peace, union, and charity, should become the parent of strife and intolerance; and so no doubt it is. But one of the first results of our analogies is to rebut this moral presumption against the Christian religion, by showing, that, if Revelation were to be in accordance with Nature, this was just what was to be expected to take place. Truth is discovered by the conflict of various schools of thought rejecting the relative or the transitory, and sects are merely schools of thought, hardened into offensive and defensive communities."<sup>5</sup> How the author can hold this opinion, while we cannot, is explained by our widely different notions about the character of Christianity. Our view—and we can never change it—is this. To the Apostles, either by Christ Himself, or by the Holy Ghost, who was "to teach them *all* truth," was committed the whole deposit of faith, in which was contained far more than the New Analogy supposes, and many of the very points that the New Analogy would allow to be worn to worthless dust by the friction of opinions. Then, to Christianity belongs a oneness, which makes the existence of sects wrong, and evil cannot be deliberately intended by God as a means to a good end. The utmost that we could allow to our author's view—and so much we can allow—is, that without schism and within the body of the undivided Church, there was to be a development or evolution of doctrines by means of the theological schools, ever submissive, however, in their disputes to the arbitration of the supreme teaching power, and never questioning those many truths that were certain from the beginning. Again, the result of the process does not end, like the study of astronomy, in a few simple propositions, but rather in the lengthening of our creed. Not so does the New Analogy think. "From the mass of opinions there is clearly eliminated faith in the historical manifestation of Christ, as that which all hold in common; those who care to retain the name of Christian go to the New Testament history of Christ's life and work as that

<sup>5</sup> Pp. 59, 60.



upon which to establish their faith and their creed. Nor, on the other hand, can any doctrine or institution which is rejected by men who, by their own profession and in the view of the world, are plainly Christian people, be regarded as fundamental, that is to say, for the positive definition of Christianity. Thus, if anything there were besides that might be deemed [by Protestants] an essential part of the Christian religion, it would be the two sacraments; and yet no one who wished to treat it in the purely scientific method could dare to reject the Society of Friends from its ranks." To us, with our notions of Christianity, this is like saying, the heart, the brain, and the lungs are defined by physiologists as "the tripod of life." Only let us defend these three vital centres, and, at least, we have saved the essence of the living man. And it is to us as the *ne plus ultra* of extravagance, when the writer goes to say: "It is true that the boundary line (if such for the purpose of argument there be) is confused in some measure by the existence of a few excellent persons who, while disbelieving, or, perhaps, rather trying to disbelieve, the New Testament history, do not, nevertheless, give up the noble name of Christian." Here let us interrupt the quotation to ask a pertinent question, in a reverse form to that asked by the King in *Hamlet*:

My fault is past. But O, what form of prayer  
Can serve my turn? Forgive my foul murder!  
That cannot be, since I am still possessed  
Of those effects for which I did the murder,—  
My crown, my own ambition, and my Queen.  
May one be pardoned and retain the offence?

Our question is; may one be Christian and not retain Christianity? "The strict requirements of Logic," continues the citation, "in an argument of this character may compel us to regard such persons as outside the number of Christian believers in the essential elements of revelation, nor, perhaps, will the common sense or human judgment of mankind find fault with this opinion. But logic is one thing, practice is another,<sup>6</sup> and practically to seek to retain the name of Christian is as honourable to them as it should be gratifying to the mass of Christian believers."<sup>7</sup> In one place the author speaks feelingly of his love of truth and his detestation of a lie: we suppose also that he considers truth something objective and not a mere fancy of

<sup>6</sup> Here again is the fallacy we have before noted about the antagonism of intellectual truth to practice.

<sup>7</sup> P. 61.

the brain, changeable according to each man's eccentricities. How, therefore, is he not alive to the inappropriateness of applying a sacred name, irrespective of whether the thing it signifies be present or not? We wish he could ponder attentively Christ's own ideas about "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth;" also about unity and sectarianism. For we feel hopeful that he might come nearer to the views of the Catholic Church, which glories in holding uncompromisingly fast to the smallest detail of revelation; and glorying also in the fact that she tolerates no substantial disagreement in doctrine, she is not moved to change her age-long custom at the warning of words like these: "There is a kind of unity about false systems, which does not admit of being disputed about, which, as it were, evaporates in the crucible of criticism. . . . So that whatever men may now think of the sectarian spirit, without it there would have been no Christianity, and it is but the exhibition in the field of religion of the law that governs all demonstrations of real truth. The evil of it lies not in difference of opinion, but in violence of temper."<sup>8</sup> This is what we call purchasing an analogy between Science and Revelation only by making the latter to be what it can never be without utterly changing its nature. The *minimum* of Christianity on which the author argues is so handled by him as to lose its right to be any portion of that which it professed to represent in kernel. Let him take his own summary of Christianity if he likes, but let him not so clothe it round with analogies from physical nature, that afterwards it is impossible to admit other Christian truths, which he declared he was only prescinding from and not denying.

We have instanced one point which we hold to be necessary Christianity, but which the book under review pitilessly sacrifices to its method of defence; and we might add further examples of what we maintain to be vital truths, which are similarly immolated for the same cause. But the one specimen already given is enough to show what is our radical objection to the work, making it impossible for us to accept a weapon which, whatever effect it may have on the enemy, will certainly be the death of ourselves. The rest of our space, therefore, we are free to devote to a few remarks of details.

First, we may be permitted to say of the continuator or revisor of the Analogy what we said of the original author,

namely, that a little more study of philosophy would be of great service. Thus we doubt whether either of the two has examined carefully how what is called argument from analogy differs from perfect induction, in which the cases are exactly similar, at least as to the point compared, and not partly similar partly dissimilar. What goes to justify this remark with regard to Butler may be found in quotations already made. And with respect to his successor, our appeal lies to passages like this : "The *only* method known to reason by which identity of origin can be proved between two different systems is *by likeness of phenomena, that is to say by analogy* ; which kind of argument has grown prodigiously in force and use since the time it was first applied to the defence of religion, so much so as would almost of itself justify the undertaking of a New Analogy. . . . All science is but the perception of likeness."<sup>9</sup> Failing here to discriminate between stricter and looser agreement in likeness, yet obscurely aware of the difference, he naturally speaks, now as if his method furnished to Revelation "the one persuasive argument over the reason of man—the appeal to the analogy of nature ;"<sup>10</sup> and at another time as if this argument did not stand alone : "As our purpose is to prove Revelation in history by its analogy with nature, our argument does not pass by, still less supersede other arguments, but rather runs a parallel course with them to the same goal." And a few lines further he "defines the position of the New Analogy" as providing, he does not say demonstration, but "a *presumption* that [Nature and Revelation] have both the same Author and Cause, *certainly so far as to answer objections* drawn from the fact that Revelation differs from Nature in one respect, namely, the supernatural element."<sup>11</sup> At least we desiderate for the interpretation of these passages a better preserved distinction between Analogy and strict Induction, between probability and certainty.<sup>12</sup> Again, still keeping to what is relevant to the portion of the subject now under consideration, we must confess ourselves sorely distressed to have our whole *proof* of the veracity of the Creator rested on an Analogy. Against the charge that we cannot take this important point for granted "a

<sup>9</sup> Pp. 6, 7.

<sup>10</sup> P. 281.

<sup>11</sup> P. 27.

<sup>12</sup> Could the author say of mere analogy, "there need not be any limit to the evidential validity and constraining logic of analogy which is to the full as competent to establish a case as to refute an objection or explain a difficulty."

hundred considerations spring up within our mind to rebut this objection, which seems so audacious and irreverent. *But in the way of reason* it is doubtful whether it can be answered at all, *except by an appeal to the course of Nature*, taken just as it is, and for no more than it displays to our reasoning faculties. For, whatever else be dubious or misleading, the course of Nature forms the standard of truth, by which every doctrine or belief may be tried. Nature does not alter her ways, nor deceive us; so long as like causes produce like effects and laws operate in the same way, and there is the same upward tendency towards higher types, so long, if we make mistakes or evince ignorance, it is only our own fault or lack of insight. So that if we have a Revelation that exhibits an Analogy with Nature in all essential particulars, we *must assume* that it comes from the same Author, even if we have no previous ground for supposing His veracity, unless indeed, in spite of the consistency of Nature, we choose to assume His untruth, which is the logic not of doubt but of madness."<sup>13</sup> One who can commit to Analogy so weighty a burden as this, will hardly surprise us when in another place, departing from his leader who makes miracles, along with prophecy, the main argument for Christianity, he on the contrary says, in sole reliance on the conformity of Christ's life to the type of natural perfection, "If the Revelation of the Son of God had been devoid of all miraculous works on His part, His origin and destiny remaining what the History represents them to be, the foundation of the Christian faith would not have been thereby affected. We do not, therefore, believe in Christ because of His wonderful works, but in His works because first of all we believe in Him."<sup>14</sup> Thus is a real substantial argument made to give place to an Analogy, in conformity with a method of defending Christianity which the author confesses to be at present "germinal and tentative." We fear that his notions about certitude, and therefore about the means of arriving at it, are astray; and, did space permit, we could give the passages which we conceive to justify his further charge against his philosophical correctness.

Next to philosophy we may take natural theology. The writer prescinds from the question whether Nature gives complete proof of the existence of religion; the point, he thinks, does not affect his argument. His view is that Nature strongly

<sup>13</sup> Pp. 279, 280.<sup>14</sup> P. 160.

suggests a religion, and, therefore, suggests that a revelation will be given in confirmation of the suggestion, it being on the Analogy of Nature that means should be provided whereby man may come to the knowledge of all that it is needful for him to know. The Christian revelation supplies just what Nature wants, and has this proof of its being from the Author of Nature, namely, that it is easily comparable with Nature, combines with Nature, and cooperates with Nature to one end. Similarly a moral code is suggested by Nature, and confirmed and elevated by Christ's revelation. Here we regret to find the light of reason declared inadequate to enforce a law of duty. "Nature annexes pleasure to the qualification of instincts quite apart from their morality; whence it follows as a matter of practice, that the words *ought* and *duty* have in Nature's mouth no supreme authority over those who choose to assert that for them happiness lies in a life of sensuousness or selfishness."<sup>15</sup> We strongly suspect, from various passages, that the author has at least two meanings to what he terms the teaching of Nature. One is a partial meaning, as in the present case. In a former part he had argued,<sup>16</sup> that "whatever we instinctively and by general consent term *natural* is attended with pleasure," and that "through pleasure it is that we emerge from evil to good, from a lower state to a higher, from the inferior grades of civilization to the superior,"<sup>17</sup> so that "we may justly infer that the Author of Nature has arranged that happiness and life shall go together, and be the appointed destiny of mankind, so far as we will appropriate them by the method which Nature describes, *reason discovers*, and *virtue practises*."<sup>18</sup> But after arguing in this strain, which supposes a deduction drawn from a broader view of the natural order, the writer narrows himself down to an accidental detail in the general economy, and, there being a certain pleasure in some vicious actions, concludes from that isolated fact that the moral code cannot be established without the light of revelation. This is another contribution to the errors of interpretation as to what is meant by "life in accordance with Nature."<sup>19</sup> Moreover, it being part of his task to discuss such a point as how far natural sources can produce a

<sup>15</sup> P. 214.<sup>16</sup> P. 136.<sup>17</sup> P. 138.<sup>18</sup> P. 139.

<sup>19</sup> Compare Mill's blunder, who says that Nature is such a ruthless, cruel, step-dame to her children that her conduct is rather to be shunned than imitated by good men. Just as if, by natural law were meant the imitation of the physical course of nature.



law of morals, the writer ought, during the discussion, to have considered the bearings of a previous remark, when he had said, "The statement, that men cannot, their reasoning powers being what they are, convince themselves of the existence of God by the way of reason only, does not seem to the writer very pertinent to the matter in hand, seeing that the persuasion of God may eventually come to man by other means than that of positive demonstration, which at the present time occupies (perhaps usurps) the whole field of knowledge. Theologians should be careful how they surrender other avenues to the natural belief of God while they are trying, perhaps in vain, to force a passage along the path down which the mass of thinking men happen just at the time to be journeying—*i.e.*, that of sensible experience. If from any means whatever—say from a predominant spiritual instinct, or the testimony of conscience to a morality inherent in nature, or even from the bare experience of Nature itself—men do actually persuade themselves that God exists, the persuasion will be just as real, though of a different kind, as if they had come by it in the way of strict reasoning from facts. I do not say they will, but that they may; and if they may, then agnosticism is itself only a most reasonable probability, and not a reasoned truth. And it is, to say the least, quite conceivable that the long dispute might end in the agnostic, while exclaiming in one breath, 'I cannot find God in Nature,' being constrained to add in the next, 'but I must believe in Him all the same.'" <sup>20</sup> We have given this passage at length, because we consider it very valuable, not for the views it sets forth, which are confused and erroneous, but for the illustration it affords of the author's style of thought. Quite in the same inconclusive, incoherent strain, he argues himself to be "justified in assuming an Author or Cause of Nature," because "we are unable to conceive of anything as uncaused; . . . nor is there the faintest indication, from what Nature teaches us, to lead us to try and imagine that it is without cause, or to help us in the least degree, to mount above or escape from this primary law of our rational understanding." Then, taking the expression "self-caused," which is often inaccurately used for self-existent and self-developing, as if the term were meant in strictest accuracy, and moreover taking "self-existent" as if it were the same as "self-caused" in the rigorous interpretation of the word, he thus proceeds on the strength of a double

<sup>20</sup> P. 41.

blunder: "Even if we were able to conceive of Nature as uncaused—that is, as self-existing—we should only be introducing surreptitiously, under cover of the word 'self,' another unknown factor into the sum of things, and the 'self' of Nature would be but another, and a very improper, uncouth, and misleading name for God." The analysis is this; self-existent is self-caused, in which idea there are two factors, a self, which causes something and the effect of this causation. Having got to a cause of the world, the writer's next step is to get at the personality of this cause by a process not very luminous. "It follows that we are fully entitled to assume a Cause of Nature, and if a Cause, then, due care being taken what use we make of the supposition, of an Author as well. For Author is but the name of the highest form of Cause known to us, viz., a Personal Being, and is therefore the proper word to employ, not merely from motives of reverence and *natural* awe, but for the strict purpose of philosophical discussion. And when I am speaking of due care I mean this: Men begin thinking of an Author of Nature, and then unconsciously come to regard him as a Personal Being like themselves. Then, as there are plainly many things in which He differs from men, they put these differences in combination or in contrast with His supposed Personal Being; and out of this they gather ideas such as Eternity, Infinity, Equality of Persons, Foreknowledge (true or not it is not our purpose to inquire) imported into the Nature of God beyond what the experience of Nature warranted. And this is what the author of the Analogy has nowhere done, and that he has not done it may be not unjustly thought the great charm of his book, and a constraining example to his successors."<sup>21</sup> Thus after having failed to give a valid reason for assuming a Cause of Nature, and for calling that Cause a Personal Being, the discussion ends by denying that natural reason can discover the attributes of God which it certainly is able to discover, and by recommending that such attributes shall simply be left out of account in an Analogy between Nature and Religion. Having mentioned the subject at all, it is a pity for the writer not to have said something more satisfactory, especially as he must know it to be one of the capital charges brought now-a-days against Butler's treatise, that, assuming an Author of Nature, he makes that Author a Personality with a definiteness so far beyond the Unknown Power, which is all

<sup>21</sup> Pp. 14—19.

that the Modern School will allow to be discoverable about the cause of natural phenomena. We do not so much say that Butler erred in his assumption, as that his successor erred in taking upon himself to justify the position, and then doing worse than nothing by the clumsiness of his attempt. To our charge of want of philosophical skill, we are obliged to add this of deficiency in natural theology.

A third point in detail, besides the two just mentioned, concerns the difficulty of revelation being supernatural. One special reason why Analogy should find it difficult to establish the supernatural element is that opponents say: We grant you all your analogies, and we multiply your analogies for you; but our conclusion is simply that your pretended supernatural is only the natural in disguise; man has idealized Nature, her methods, her forces, and her several phenomena, and he has mistaken the result for revelation. The New Analogy does not explicitly state this difficulty, but it has some idea of meeting it in the fourth chapter, entitled, "On the Improbability from Analogy that Revelation was produced from the Course of Things." Appeal is made to the historic origin of Christianity, and after this old and valid answer to objectors, the best new argument goes on the lines, that no human knowledge could have fitted on a religion so analogous to the course of Nature; that the Christian revelation avoids contradictions of Nature which false religions could not have avoided, for want of better acquaintance with physical laws on the part of the founders; and that recent science is daily confirming what Christianity long ago anticipated. "Revelation assumes the form, not of a congeries of doctrines and beliefs such as a number of persons might unite in composing, but of a *course*, or *system*, or dispensation, such as we commonly take Nature to be, and wrought by definite principles into the counterpart of Nature itself. And if we press for further information, we do, as in Nature so in Revelation, but find ourselves in presence of those mysterious sources of all Created things, which we experience every moment we act or think, but of these primal forces themselves know nothing." With a New Testament in one hand and a book of science in the other, it is said, a man may convince himself that a Revelation has been given by the Author of Nature to harmonize and complete the work.

Probably a scientific man would dispute the fact that revelation can be proved to have so abstained from meddling with

science on the one side, and on the other so anticipated its results in some cases, as to give proof demonstrative of its supernatural origin. A Catholic theologian in his turn would reject many of the analogies imposed by our author upon the so-called *minimum* of Christianity; and, not admitting these analogies, he could not admit the anticipation of scientific principles that they are supposed to contain. And thus the original difficulty is not solved.

Space will not permit us to follow our author into the development of his several analogies. As in the Old Testament God took up rites, ceremonies, and pieces of symbolism which were common in the country—even the pagan country—in which Israel was dwelling, and consecrated these to the religion He revealed; and as pious writers have sought similitudes of the Trinity in Creation; so we may well believe that there are many analogies between science and faith. At present, however, this hardly seems a promising field whereon to choose a battleground against irreligion. Yet our author, whose opinion is different, imagines he has a strong cause when he compares sin with reversion to an older and inferior type; salvation by sacrifice to progress in nature by higher forms arising on the extinction of the lower; fewness of the witnesses of the resurrection to the survival of the fittest, the Scripture phrase for which is “many are called but few are chosen;” the revelation of the Holy Spirit as an abiding, life-giving influence to the force of organisation in Nature. Of course these examples lose such force as they had by being taken out of their context and development; but the bare mention of their nature will serve to show the writer’s great desire to recommend revelation by paralleling it with the favourite theory of evolution through struggle, destruction of the less worthy, and survival of the more worthy, in an ever-ascending order.

Whilst admiring the author and his purpose, we have been forced to disapprove of his work; and our comments have turned wholly on the points we disapprove. We believe his book to be founded on a surrender of much that is vital to Christianity; and his arguments to be often unphilosophical, inconsistent, and irrelevant, whilst the writer himself is not on the look out to see the full range of his own reasonings. He is content rather with what suits the convenience of the moment. He has to make up theories as he goes on; whereas the work he has undertaken would require the preparation of a long

training in philosophy and theology.<sup>22</sup> No man can invent or form these sciences on the spur of the moment, or even by the unaided efforts of a single lifetime. It requires generations of successive workers to see all round these vast regions and to draw out the maps, which will enable others to tread these intricate paths without losing themselves. Against the adventurous attempts of amateur explorers the New Analogy is a warning. We simply defy the author to accept the New Testament and keep the New Analogy.

<sup>22</sup> It really is important that men should value consistency more than they do. Consistency is not a certain sign of truth, but inconsistency is a certain sign of error. As one specimen among thousands of self-contradiction, take the following account of Mr. Beecher's collected sermons: "Mr. Beecher is so completely satisfied about what is morally and spiritually true in the Bible that [his own impeachments on the accuracy and authenticity of the volume] do not disturb him, and this is highly characteristic of his mind. It is a mind which, whilst it has developed itself in practical grasp and readiness by constant preaching, has been left undeveloped in mental consistency, as only the habit of constant preaching can leave a mind undeveloped. It is the instantaneous reflection of all that is going on around him that gives him his power. He will state one view of truth that is uppermost at the time, and at another time he will state another view, which it would be difficult to accept were the first truth present to the mind of his hearers; but then it is not so, and so no one is perplexed, and every one goes away with the idea that there is no real difficulty in believing, and no real difficulty in acting" (the *Contemporary Review*, February, 1872).



### *Cape Clear: A Retrospect.*

AMONGST the numerous islands that encircle the sea-girt shores of Ireland, there is not one more interesting than the island of Cape Clear.

A glance at the map will show its position off the extreme South-west coast of Ireland. Every steamboat crossing the Atlantic passes close to its shore. It is the last point of his native country which fades away from the view of the departing emigrant, and the first that salutes the eye of him whom fond attachment, business, or pleasure induces to revisit its shores. It is more interesting still to the Catholic reader from its ancient sacred character, the primitive purity and faith of its inhabitants, the sad trial to which that faith has been exposed in modern days, and the ultimate and complete triumph over the enemies of our holy religion.

It is the purpose of the present paper to touch as briefly as may be on these various points, and to rescue from comparative oblivion an island and a people once the most miserable, but now the most happy and contented on the shores of our island.

The island of Cape Clear is situated in the broad Atlantic, the nearest point of the mainland—Baltimore—being six miles distant. Viewed from any side it presents the appearance of a huge excrescence on the surface of the deep. Its length is four miles, and width one mile. Within the memory of men still living it contained twelve hundred inhabitants. The various vicissitudes of fortune, to which the whole country was subjected, have reduced the population to six hundred.

The name by which the island was known to Latin writers was "Insula Sancta Clara." In the language of the country it was Innis Cleire, the island of the clergy. In modern phraseology the word Innis, island, is changed to Cape; and Cleire, of the clergy, has been corrupted into Clear: hence Cape Clear. The sacred character of its ancient name is principally derived from the fact of its being the birthplace and subsequent home of one

of Ireland's earliest and most illustrious saints, St. Kieran. There have been many lives of the saint, and no small controversy has arisen concerning the time of his mission and labours. Several authors, ancient and modern, hold the existence in Ireland before the time of St. Patrick of four distinguished saints, and amongst them Kieran held the most honoured place. Others, however, allow no ante-Patrician saints in Ireland, and they place Kieran amongst that illustrious band of saints, who, animated by the spirit and emulating the example of our glorious apostle, St. Patrick, completed his holy work and planted the faith of Christ over the entire surface of the island. Whatever be the result of this controversy, it is sufficient for our present purpose to know that all are substantially agreed on one point, viz., that St. Kieran was a native of Cape Clear, that he was ordained or consecrated bishop in Rome, that he returned and preached the Gospel in his native island, residing there for a considerable time, and finally left it to found the monastery of Saiger, near Kilkenny, of which diocese he died bishop. And here it may be interesting to observe how largely our early Irish saints participated in that spirit of ascetic solitude which was characteristic of the saints of God's Church in the most primitive ages of Christianity. Not satisfied with covering the face of the land with churches and monasteries for holy men and women, they seized on all the islands around the coast. The smallest islets, nay oftentimes almost inaccessible crags, the lonely haunts of the wild sea birds, were their chosen home. The writer a short time ago landed on an island near Cape Clear called St. Keames, a corruption of the Irish St. Skauve (a sainted woman and supposed relative of St. Kieran). This island consists of about fifty acres of land and is occupied by two families. On the brow of a cliff are the ruins of a monastery or convent founded by this saint. So holy was this island considered that until a late period the inhabitants of the mainland adjacent were wont to bring their dead miles across the sea for interment there. The waves of time and ocean have made sad havoc of the foundations of the monastery, and as they crumble away the bones of the long-buried dead are frequently carried away by the receding waters.

To return to Cape Clear. St. Kieran converted his native island to the faith, and in commemoration of it planted on the strand a large pillar stone, which stands undisturbed to this day. On the top of the pillar is a raised cross, and one on the

front cut into the stone. Archeologists who have visited the island, and compared the shape of the stone and form of the crosses with others of wellknown antiquity, have not hesitated to ascribe its erection to the remotest era of Christianity in Ireland. The pillar stone stands on the shore of a little haven called St. Kieran's haven, the most picturesque and sequestered that the imagination can conceive. The sea enters by a narrow creek into a small basin, which is surrounded on all sides by precipitous cliffs and rugged hills, clad in the lovely mingled colours of pink and yellow—the native furze blossom and luxuriant heather. Near the pillar stone and below high water mark a spring of purest water from a holy well gushes forth to mingle with the tide. It is called St. Kieran's well, and on the 4th of March, the eve of the saint's festival, the pious people of the island may be seen on the departure of the tide, in the sacred stillness of approaching night, reciting their beads and invoking the intercession of their beloved saint. A little further on the shore is the ruined church, its ivied walls still standing with its small oriel window and its lancet side lights. Around it, from time immemorial, the kith and kin of the island have found their last resting place. Nowhere perhaps in the wide world is the plaintive wail of the Irish woman, as she laments in her own peculiar poetic caoin over the grave of a beloved one, heard with such emotional effect, as her voice and words re-echo along the surrounding cliffs, accompanied, as it often is, by the solemn dirge of the angry ocean. St. Kieran is then the prominent figure in the ancient history of the island. His festival (5th of March) has ever been with the islanders a holiday of strictest obligation, and the resident priest of the island never fails on that day to celebrate the divine mysteries amid the most crowded congregation of the year. All the male children who happen to be baptized on or about that day rejoice in the name of Kieran.

The island was originally peopled by the clan Heiderdriscoll, or O'Driscoll, whose feudal chief resided at Baltimore. O'Driscoll is then the prevailing name in the island, and the advent of those who bear a different name can be traced by old men still living. The physique of the inhabitants is singularly typical of the fine old Irish race; still primitive in their mode of living, they have yet to learn the debilitating effects of modern progress and luxury. Strangers who visit the island never fail to admire the manly proportions of the fishermen, the glow of

perfect health on their open countenance, and their natural aptitude for their rude and hazardous calling. Every adult who can grasp an oar or line is a fisherman. Nearly all till a small portion of land, from which they derive a simple sustenance, potatoes, fish, and milk being their only diet. From time immemorial they have intermarried, never, however, closer than the third degree of kindred; nor has this custom had the slightest degenerating effect on their progeny. Indeed, their communication with the mainland until recently was very infrequent, consisting principally in taking their fish to market to Skibbereen, a distance of eighteen miles, and returning home with the next convenient tide. Living thus isolated for centuries, and intermarrying amongst themselves, their traditions are naturally very perfect. Of all those traditions, the holiest and the best is their preservation of the pure faith which was planted in their island by their kinsman St. Kieran. At what period of their history a total change in religion was effected, as Protestants aver, when and by whom the holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and other practical and painful ordinances of the Catholic Church were introduced, this very perfect tradition is silent as the grave. However that be, it is a wellknown fact that the island was absolutely free from the slightest taint of heresy to within a very recent period. It was the proud boast of the islanders that the churchyard of St. Kieran was never desecrated by the interment of any one professing other than their own hallowed faith. But this was not to be.

The awful visitation which befell the people of Ireland by the great failure of the potato crop brought with it many dire calamities. Its character, magnitude, and results constitute a memorable epoch in the annals of the country. It is needless to recapitulate the utterly helpless condition of the people, the dreadful pangs of hunger, the wasting emaciation of stalwart men and tender women, the famine fever, and the holocaust of millions. But in no part of Ireland was the visitation so severely felt as amongst the poor crowded population of the coast and islands. Indeed, the first recorded death from starvation occurred not many miles from Cape Clear, on the coast at Myross.

It was at this period of writhing national agony that the arch enemy of our holy religion prompted his agents in Great Britain and Ireland to attempt the spiritual ruin of the faithful Irish people. What in the past could not be effected by the

sword, by confiscation, by corruption, was to be accomplished by money and want. An organization, unexampled for material power and varied resources, was called into existence. That deep seated bigotry, which for centuries lay like a night-mare on the clouded intellect of the English people, was aroused—the fanatical instincts of prayerful Scripture-reading women were excited by hopeful appeals—the forlorn condition of the Irish people created a spiritual harvest of the most promising kind—hunger and want rendered the souls of the poor Irish peculiarly amenable to scriptural consolation, and nothing was wanted but money to transform the faith of an entire race and nation—and money was forthcoming. No faithful record will ever reveal the almost fabulous sums which were collected and devoted to this nefarious purpose. This mighty organization resolved itself into numerous departments. There was the Irish Mission Society, the Irish Bible Society, the Society for the Diffusion of the Irish Language, with many other cognate associations, and finally the Ladies Coast and Island Society. Thus the islands, for reasons not far to seek, were relegated to the tender patronage of the ladies. The organization was now complete, the executive appointed, central bureaux established in the Metropolis, a goodly sum of money collected and operations commenced. Let us see what was the condition of Cape Clear at this unhappy juncture. Isolated as we have seen from intercourse or ties of kindred with the mainland, the inhabitants were thrown utterly on their own limited resources ; and these resources soon failed. Their staple food entirely disappeared ; Indian meal of the coarsest and cheapest kind had to be carried eighteen miles by water, often at the peril of their lives. To purchase that, ready money was necessary ; for few were found to trust the distant islander. With the food disappeared their fishing gear, their clothes, nay, even the beds they lay on, pledged in pawn offices never to return. Then hunger and want in the most aggravated and hopeless form pervaded the island. The resident priest was powerless to relieve them. He often suffered with them the want of the comforts, if not the necessities, of life, and was mainly supported by the alms of his brethren in the diocese. Such was the condition of Cape Clear at this critical period.

The village of Baltimore is situate on the mainland nearest the island. The Protestant incumbent was old, infirm, and non-resident. At this time the duties devolved on a curate who was



paid for his ministrations the magnificent sum of £70 a year. This was indeed a miserable pittance for the support of a large and increasing family. The curate, however—he shall be nameless here (he is since dead)—though poor in means, was rich in expedients. Perhaps, in the entire confraternity of proselytizing agents there was not another so unctuous in language and so versatile in pen. Where all were highly active he was *primus inter pares*. He threw himself, with boundless energy, into the new spiritual movement and uprising. But a field was necessary for his labours. He cast a shrewd glance over “Carbery’s hundred isles,” alighted on Cape Clear, and like the philosopher of old, exclaimed “I have found it.” The tempter laid his approaches adroitly. There happened to be residing in the island a Protestant lightkeeper and his family. Although they belonged to another parish in the Protestant distribution of territory, our astute curate determined on visiting them and imparting spiritual consolation. The lighthouse thenceforward formed his *point d’appui*. From this commanding height he scanned with bated breath the condition of the inhabitants. Amongst them was an imported land bailiff, an unworthy Catholic of Protestant descent, who, by his misconduct, incurred the displeasure of the resident priest. He with his young family was easily seduced from the faith, and was at once installed as Bible reader and occasional preacher of the Gospel at a handsome salary. Our curate was elated with this first success. He determined to cast to the winds his salary of £70 at Baltimore and fix his residence in the island. The lord of the soil readily granted him a house and farm of land. The house, a deserted coastguard station, was in ruins. The farm was capable of much improvement. Here was an opportunity of giving employment, and thus coming into close contact with the poor islanders. It was readily availed of. The famishing fishermen were invited to hew stones, to bring timber, slate, and other materials. A large and commodious residence soon rose by the shore of South Harbour. Large sums were expended in improving the land and enclosing a beautiful garden. During these operations, though an adept in the vernacular, the common language of his native kingdom of Kerry, he studiously avoided all mention of religion. He only came among them forsooth to relieve their sufferings, and give remunerative employment. He now discovered the necessity of building a school. Although there was already in the island a national school under the patronage of

the Government, it did not commend itself to his spiritual or intellectual tastes. To this employment the people demurred. The cloven foot began to be apparent. However, the edict went forth. There was to be no relief, no employment, unless at the proselytizing school in their midst. It was verily a crucial test. Who that witnessed the struggle can ever forget it? The writer of this sketch does not speak or write from hearsay. He was personally and practically cognizant of many a heart-rending scene. As his mind reverts to the sad spectacle which that once happy island then presented to his view, his memory conjures up a prostrate starving people, an island of mendicants. He seems to see before him again the attenuated living forms of manhood, the pallid features, the graceful figures of youth changed into the seeming decrepitude of old age, the agony of the dying, and the coffinless dead.

*Quis talia fando*

*Temperet a lacrymis?*

This school, spacious enough for the entire youth of the island, was built. A pervert teacher with a large family and school-mistress were imported from the mainland. Yet there was a lack of school children. Now it so happened that the glebe lands of the neighbouring parish of Kilcoe were situated in the island of Cape Clear. The reason of this strange anomaly is involved in obscurity. But there it was surrounding the old Church of St. Kieran, and occupied by three Catholic tenants. Two of them were promptly evicted, and their holdings handed over to imported Protestants and perverts. Thus a tolerable attendance was secured for the schools. And now the final crowning enterprise presented itself to the gaze of the parson. He resolved to build a church. The most vigorous appeals for aid were now made. Tracts were printed and circulated far and wide, containing the most pathetic description of the benighted islanders, their docility, their avidity even to hear the Word of God preached to them. Once the church was erected in their midst and its doors open to receive them, the light of the Gospel would illumine the whole island, and there was an end for ever to their darkness and idolatry.

Exeter Hall and the Dublin Rotundo at the May and April meetings resounded with glowing reports of this island of converts. Torrents of money flowed in. A royal personage

headed the list. The late Queen Adelaide subscribed £100. Many of the nobility followed and a more than sufficient sum was promptly realized. There was now abundance of money and employment. In an incredible short time the church was completed. It is a beautiful artistic structure, its walls of cut-stone, and its lofty Gothic roof. It cost at least £2,000, and was capable of sitting three hundred worshippers. The interior was fitted out in a style of comfort and luxury which often appalled the poor creatures who crept within its precincts, bowed down with remorse and fear. The dedication of the new church was in due course celebrated by a jubilant assembly of laymen and clerics, and with an audacious contempt of all the pious traditions of the island was named St. Kieran's Church.

The Establishment was now complete. There was the parson with his numerous family, attended exclusively by pervert servants; pervert teachers in the schools; pervert Bible readers roaming through the island forcing their way into the houses of the poor; and behind all, was that most effective of motive powers, money. There was daily food and warm raiment for the children who frequented the schools, there was employment, houses, lands, for those who frequented the church. Even the sea was made subservient to the propagandism. A fine hooker, fitted with the best fishing appliances, was at the disposal of the faithless fisherman.

It is no wonder, amidst such corrupting influence, that several swerved from the faith and fell victims to the wiles of the tempter. A system of hypocrisy and demoralization ensued which no words could describe. The unhappy perverts avoided as much as possible the sight of the priest; and did one of them meet him on the wayside, his form was bent down and his eyes cast on the ground in shame and remorse. It was a sad but instructive treat afterwards, when they returned to the bosom of the Church, to listen to their experiences in infidelity—the first great struggle with the promptings of conscience, the torture they endured on their first entrance to church, their efforts not to listen to the sermon, how they carried their beads in their pockets, and silently counted them over as a talisman against the address of the preacher, the troubled time they spent on Sacrament Sunday, endeavouring to retain in their mouths the elements of the so-called Lord's Supper until they left the precincts of the church to cast them

forth on the ground. In many instances the demoralization assumed a worse form. Although they professed the faith outwardly, their religious instincts were deadened and they became utterly indifferent.

One fine Sabbath morning, the priest having heard that one of his people was just about to go to church, found him out and accosted him. "Well, Nat," said he, "what is this I have heard of you? Are you going to church this morning?" "Well, Father," said Nat, "I'm like the man on the single ditch, I don't know on what side I'm to fall." Poor Nat is still living, and, though in a chronic state of poverty, rejoices much that he fell on the right side that Sunday morning.

We have now followed that vile system to the acme of its fortunes. It is time to record its decay and utter extinction. In the year 1846 the first attempt was made on the faith of the island: in the year 1856 the last native islander returned to the Church. The record of this happy result would be incomplete indeed, without the mention of the honoured name of one, who has since passed away to receive the reward of the good and faithful servant of his God. The late Very Rev. Henry Leader at this critical period received the pastoral charge of the islands and a portion of the mainland. With what untiring zeal and successful energy he grappled with and crushed proselytism in Cape Clear is well known to his brethren in the ministry. How in after years and other missions he spent himself for the poor and wretched, the thousands who wept at his unexpected obsequies bore ample testimony. It is a sad but pleasing duty on the part of one who was a constant witness of his labours to lay this simple wreath on his tomb.

A few years after the erection of the church the Establishment gave unmistakable signs of rapid dissolution. The dread famine had passed away. The land bore its fruit. The charity of the humane at home and abroad was directed to the island, and the poor fishermen were provided with boats and fishing gear to pursue their calling on the deep. Of the unhappy perverts, some after returning to the fold emigrated to other lands, others remained and led for many years a life of privation and poverty: a few remained in their apostacy until the hand of sickness and death lay heavily on them. The last conversion of a native islander was that of the servant of the Protestant minister, and she had to be removed from the parsonage to a cabin close by in order to receive the last rites of the Church.

It was inexpressibly sad but consoling to be witness of the dying moments of one of those returning sinners. The writer of this sketch was called to the sick bed of the sexton of the church. He had been fifteen years an apostate, leading, as he freely acknowledged, a life of confirmed and constant hypocrisy. Being a man of keen intelligence, he was imported into the island to influence others by his vile example. But his hour had come, and I promptly responded to the call. The parson, who was informed of my movements, followed at once, and we stood together in the presence of the dying man. Years, many years have since elapsed, but the scene is before me as of yesterday. The miserable man grasped my hand, held it long, kissing and bathing it with floods of tears. He welcomed me in accents almost of despair, amidst violent coughing, and throwing up of blood. "Would God ever pardon him?" "Would His Blessed Mother have pity on him?" was his constant cry. He never even noticed the parson, who stood statue-like in the room, and soon retired, if not a better at least a wiser man; and I was left alone to administer that consolation which our loving Mother the Church prescribes even for the most abandoned. The poor penitent was spared some time to repent of his errors, and die in the peace and friendship of God. His death bore fruit in the immediate conversion of several who attended his remains to the grave.

To return. As was remarked before, the Establishment was in a state of collapse. Our worthy curate was promoted to a benefice, and was never known afterwards to take any interest in the spiritual concerns of his Catholic neighbours. A few other ambitious curates succeeded to his charge, until finally the concern was abandoned in disgust. The official staff has been long since dissolved and dispersed, teachers and children have abandoned the schools. The spacious school-house is the habitation of a Catholic fisherman and his family. The glebe lands have been sold out by the Church Temporalities Commission, and purchased by two Catholics who are now peasant proprietors, in the truest sense of the word. The beautiful parsonage with its once luxuriant garden and outlying farm is occupied by a Catholic fisherman and pilot, who, in irony of fate, dates his infrequent letters from the "Glebe House," Cape Clear. Of the motley congregation which once thronged the church, two Protestant families (not perverts) remain, the one a struggling farmer, the other a poor labourer living on



casual employment from his Catholic neighbours. Once a month, when the sea is calm and the wind favourable, the good-natured rector of Baltimore may be seen crossing the water to give them some comfort in their spiritual desolation. The church alone stands empty and deserted. The grass grows rank on the threshold of its vestibule. The rain and tempest have made sad havoc of its beautiful windows and exquisite woodwork. The mould of ages seems to creep over its chiselled stone and high-pitched roof. Most of those who were old enough to mingle in the strife of passion and of pain, of hypocrisy and sin, excited by its erection, have passed away, but there it still stands over the lonely shore, picturesque even in decay, an abiding monument of baffled hopes and stupendous folly.

A pleasing task remains to discharge. It is to relate how by a happy turn of fortune the fishermen of Cape Clear, from a condition of abject wretchedness and poverty, have arisen into independence and prosperity.

Of all the industrial resources of Ireland the sea fisheries have most deteriorated. It is notorious that the seas close to our shores, especially in the south and west, have ever been teeming with fish of every description. During the years of famine, fishermen, boats, and fishing appliances were alike swept away. Almost a new generation sprung up to manhood, who lacked even the skill necessary for fishing pursuits. Successive Governments, though liberal in encouragement to other parts of the United Kingdom, little heeded the frequent appeals made on behalf of the fishermen of Ireland. The Irish gentleman of the past disdained to embark his capital in such projects as fishery companies. Hence in the competition arising from the rapidly increased consumption of fish as an article of diet, the Irish fisherman was left far behind. In summer time and in fair weather he fished close to the shore, or now and again in his crazy open hooker, ventured on the main. But the scanty produce of his labour went to feed his own family, or realize a few pounds at Christmas in the next market town. It was thus with the fishermen of Cape Clear until about a dozen years ago, when a notable discovery was made.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is a curious fact connected with the migration of fish. For the first half of the last century the Pilchard fishery was in a most flourishing state on the south-western shores of Ireland. Almost suddenly the fish migrated and turned up on the coast of Cornwall, where it still remains. As the capture and curing of Pilchards is

The macherel, a fish which roams the ocean in myriad shoals, was found in its migrations to select the south-west coast of Ireland for its feeding ground during the early months of the year. Thither flocked at once fleets of fishing smacks from every shore: from France, from the north of England, from the Isle of Man, from Arklow and other parts of Ireland, so that the combined fleet off Cape Clear often numbered seven hundred vessels. When it is borne in mind that each vessel realized from £400 to £600 for the season, it will be easily seen what a golden harvest the strangers gathered on our coasts. The unhappy fisherman of Cape Clear gazed with wonder and envy on this strange invasion on his shores. For him there was no part in this wealth beneath the water. Year after year he looked on and sighed for the possession of a boat, which would enable him to compete with the strangers, and gather to himself a portion of that wealth which was literally floating at his door. But how could he procure £400 to £500 to purchase a boat and train of nets?

A few years ago an appeal for help was made to one, to whom a well-deserving appeal was never made in vain. A lady, illustrious in position, but far more illustrious by the more than princely acts of beneficence which have immortalized her name, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, took pity on the forlorn condition of the islanders. This is not the time or place to recount her varied and repeated acts of generous kindness. Her name is a household word in the island. It will suffice to say that within the last two years she has devoted £5,000 to the purchase of boats in the district. The hardy fishermen of Cape Clear have risen to the occasion, and, as it were, vindicated the sovereignty of their own waters. Amidst the numerous fleets of fishing vessels from many lands, there are none better appointed than theirs, better manned, better worked. Dauntless in the strife of elements, their post is in the van. They face the storm and the billow when others lie in the port. Their little fleet absorbs the youth and manhood of the island. They have succeeded beyond the wildest dreams of the past. Peace and comfort and happiness pervade the hearths and homes of the islanders.

a special branch of the trade, Irishmen from near Bantry were induced to take up their residence in Cornwall to instruct the Cornish men in the art. Their descendants having slightly disguised their Celtic name and lost the faith of their fathers may still be recognized there. But what is still more curious, the Pilchards have again appeared on the south coast of Ireland, and Cornish men have to be introduced to teach the mode of curing and preparing them for market to the Irish fishermen.

Utter strangers to the political and social agitations which have convulsed the land, they look to the mighty ocean for subsistence, and the ocean, responsive to their call, has supplied them with abundance.

The strangers, and they are many, who visit Cape Clear in the beautiful summer-time, are wondrously charmed with the island and its people, and always leave impressed with the conviction that, if, what one kind heart and hand had accomplished for them, were extended around our coasts, the fisheries of Ireland would assert themselves, and become a fruitful source of great national industry and wealth.

C. DAVIS.

### *Catholic Penances.*

ASSERTION without proof, or at best with only the semblance of a proof, is a favourite form of argument with Dr. Littledale. A remarkable specimen of this is to be found in his two sections on Roman Penances and their contradictions.<sup>1</sup>

He begins with this formidable preamble: "Let us now turn to the question of Roman penances. If these did but fairly represent the ascetic and self-denying side of Christianity, the subjugation of flesh to spirit (not the injury of the first to the injury of the second), and desire to be conformed to Christ's suffering life, no thoughtful Christian could censure them. But they stand on a very different footing." We are prepared for some startling revelation of Roman laxity on the one hand and Roman brutality on the other, the latter being of the two the more clearly foreshadowed in the malicious parenthesis, "not the injury of the first to the injury of the second." Nor are we disappointed. He actually fulfils, as far as assertion goes, the promise of his opening sentence. He makes out the Church to be scandalously indulgent to sinners, but almost a fakir and quite a Manichee in her cruelty to the saints. This he authoritatively declares with the coolest audacity. How he justifies his pronouncement we invite our readers to judge.

Roman penances must be a proof of laxity in dealing with sinners: this is the first conclusion aimed at, and it is intended to lead up to that other terrible inference—that Rome practically disbelieves in the forgiveness of sins.

To prove his charge of laxity, Dr. Littledale points vaguely to the "primitive Church." Whether or no he is aware that the penitential discipline of the primitive Church comprehended every variety of treatment from Pauline clemency<sup>2</sup> to Tertullianic severity, we are at a loss to determine. If he knew it, he did well to say nothing about it, for the severity which the Montanist

<sup>1</sup> *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome*, pp. 142—145.

<sup>2</sup> 2 Cor. ii. 10.

and Novatian heresies called forth suits his purpose better. The mild discipline of the Apostolic age and of the greater part of the second century is too much akin to that of our own times,<sup>3</sup> and Dr. Littledale, we suppose, would hesitate to accuse the Apostles of laxity. Anyhow, we will meet him on his own ground.

We say, then, that even granting the severity of the third and fourth centuries to be an improvement on the practice of the Apostles, it does not follow that the present practice is in any way worthy of censure. For the Church, while admitting of no change in the deposit of faith, cannot be blamed for adapting her disciplinary enactments to the varying conditions and circumstances of the faithful. The laws which she thought proper to enforce in the early ages of fervour and in later ages of strong faith, she is wise in mitigating to suit the weaker wills and the lesser lights of modern times. Thus it has happened that absolution, for which, in the third and fourth centuries, as is commonly taught,<sup>4</sup> sinners were generally obliged to prepare themselves by a long course of penance, is now comparatively easy of attainment, as it was in the days of St. John<sup>5</sup> and St. Paul. The essential requisite is always the same—no sins are pardoned without deep heartfelt sorrow; but the non-essential preparation which could prudently be expected of men who lived in an atmosphere of high religious thought can no longer be required of men who are surrounded by the ruins of faith outside of the Church, and who cannot but breathe the enervating air of misbelief and unbelief. Alpine climbing is all very well for tough muscles and healthy lungs; but an asthmatic patient would choke before he got half way up the Matterhorn. Dr. Littledale would have everyone climb the Matterhorn of primitive penance; like all advocates of primitive discipline,<sup>6</sup> he is eager to magnify the Church of the past, which cannot hurt him, because he thinks he can thus vilify the Church of the present which condemns him.

"The penances of the primitive Church," he says, "were all inflicted before absolution was conferred. That once

<sup>3</sup> Petavius, *De Penit.* lib. ii. c. viii. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Though we hold with Hurter (*Theol. Dogm.* t. iii. note to n. 551) that the sacramental absolution was given soon after the confession of sins, and that the long-delayed absolution mentioned by early writers was merely a ceremony of reconciliation, we give Dr. Littledale the benefit of the common hypothesis.

<sup>5</sup> Petavius, l. c. n. 15. Cf. the testimony of Eusebius in the MONTH, July, 1881, p. 398.

<sup>6</sup> Zaccaria, *Dissert. di Storia Eccles.* t. iii. diss. 33 initio.



granted, and the penitent restored to Church communion, they ceased."<sup>7</sup> Observe: Dr. Littledale takes the practice to have been universal, admitting of no exception, for he means to draw the inference that penance before absolution is a dogmatic necessity, a *sine qua non* of forgiveness. Unfortunately facts are dead against him, and one single adverse fact, one case where penance is curtailed, is enough to upset his theory; for that one fact would prove that the time and the nature of the penance are matters of expediency.

It is generally admitted<sup>8</sup> that ever since the end of the fourth century, when Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, abolished the office of Penitentiary, the Greeks have given absolution immediately after the confession of sins, and before the penance imposed by the priest has been performed. But besides this practice of the early Eastern Church, we are able to adduce, during a period when the discipline was most severe, at least seven cases in which absolution was habitually granted before the penance had been partially or completely performed.

*First case:* When the penitent was in danger of death and had applied for his penance. The thirteenth canon of the first Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) begins thus: "As to those who are approaching their end, the ancient and regular law (*ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος*) shall be observed; so that if anyone depart this life he be not deprived of the last and necessary viaticum," which, in the case of the dying in the early Church, always presupposes absolution. Similar provisions are made by the fourth Council of Carthage<sup>9</sup> (A.D. 398) and the first Council of Orange<sup>10</sup> (A.D. 441), and it is noteworthy that these three canons, of three different Councils, ranging over more than a century, send the penitent back to his penance in the event of recovery. True, the penitent was not restored to legal Church communion, *legitima communio*, as the Council of Orange calls it,<sup>11</sup> till after the completion of his penance; but the sacramental reconciliation was, in the words of the same Council, "sufficient for the consolation of the dying man," which nothing short of absolution could be; and therefore it is clear that the penances were not "all inflicted before absolution."

<sup>7</sup> P. 142.

<sup>8</sup> See Petavius, *De Penit.* lib. ii. c. 8, n. 2 and c. 9, n. 4; also Morinus, *De Penit.* lib. vi. c. 24.

<sup>9</sup> Can. 76.

<sup>10</sup> Can. 3.

<sup>11</sup> L. c.

*Second case:* When there was reason to fear that the deferring of the absolution might induce the penitent to go over to the heretics or the pagans. Here we are all the more willing to quote St. Cyprian, because he is the only one of the Fathers whom Dr. Littledale has pressed into his service on this question.

The terrible cruelty of the persecution under Decius had led numbers of Christians into a faint-hearted denial of their faith.<sup>12</sup> The very multitude of the lapsed seems to have made them insolent, when, the danger once past, they claimed to be re-admitted into the fold, relying on letters of recommendation from the confessors who had suffered for the faith. St. Cyprian, together with his clergy, provisionally decreed that those of the lapsed who were dying should be reconciled at the hour of death, but that the others should await the ruling of the Councils that would assemble as soon as peace was restored to the Church. These Councils, held in Rome and in Africa, decreed that the *libellatici*,<sup>13</sup> with no other penance than that which they were known to have done since their fall, should be reconciled to the Church; that even the *sacrificati*,<sup>14</sup> long though their penance must needs be, should not, however, be refused reconciliation<sup>15</sup> when in danger of death. Thereupon, Antonianus, a bishop of some note at that time, wrote to St. Cyprian in a way that showed him, as the latter says in his reply,<sup>16</sup> to have been under the influence of Novatian. Certain it is that, if Antonianus did not favour the rising heresy, he at least shared the opinions of a rigid school with which St. Cyprian had no sympathy. Antonianus's letter has not come down to us; but St. Cyprian's answer is so full on the question of disciplinary relaxation that we cannot but commend it to Dr. Littledale's careful perusal. One passage will be enough to show how the great champion of the Church in the middle of the third century held that, in moments of imminent danger to the soul, the penance was to be cut short, and that it was quite sufficient for absolution that the priest should discern in his penitent some signs of sincere conversion. These are the Saint's words: "If we reject their repentance when they afford us some confidence that their

<sup>12</sup> See Morinus, *De Penit.* lib. i. c. 19, n. 2.

<sup>13</sup> Those Christians who bribed the magistrates or procured substitutes, and thus obtained certificates of having sacrificed, though they had not, were called *libellatici*.

<sup>14</sup> Those who had burnt incense or eaten of the victims were called *sacrificati*.

<sup>15</sup> *Pacem* (Morinus, l.c.).

<sup>16</sup> S. Cypr. Ep. 52. Migne, Pat. Lat. t. 3, col. 763.

conscience is in a moderately good state,<sup>17</sup> at once, with their wives and children whose lives they have preserved, they hurry off at the devil's invitation into heresy or schism; and it will be laid at our door in the day of judgment that we have not tended the wounded sheep, and for one that was wounded have lost many that were sound, and that, whereas the Lord left the ninety-nine sound ones and went to seek the stray and weary one and, having found it, carried it on His own shoulders, we not only do not go after the lapsed, but we turn them away when they come to us, and whilst false prophets cease not nowadays to lay waste and rend Christ's flock, we let in the dogs and wolves, so as to ruin by our harshness and inhumanity those whom a hostile persecution did not ruin."

Assuredly St. Cyprian never would have written in this way, had he thought that the previous completion of the penance was necessary for absolution.

*Third case:* When a persecution was at hand, absolution was given to the lapsed before the fulfilment of their penance, to strengthen them for martyrdom. St. Cyprian, writing with his fellow-bishops to Pope Cornelius on the mitigation of penance owing to the threatened persecution, says: "But now peace is necessary not for the sick, but the strong; not to the dying, but to the living is Church communion (*communicatio*) to be granted by us, that we may not leave those unarmed and naked whom we excite and exhort to the combat, but fortify them with the protection of the blood and body of Christ."<sup>18</sup> And in answer to the objection put forth by some, that the lapsed need not be so readily absolved, for that martyrs are washed in their own blood, he adds: "He cannot be fit for martyrdom who is not armed by the Church for battle, and the mind faints which the Eucharist received lifteth not up and kindleth not."<sup>19</sup>

Is this not precisely the argument so often used against the Jansenists, who would leave the sinner to fight unshriven, and

<sup>17</sup> "Quorum si poenitentiam respuamus habentium aliquam fiduciam tolerabilis conscientie" (Migne, *ib.* col. 781). Natalis Alexander interprets the phrase thus: "Modo sinceræ conversionis et veræ contritionis signa proderent" (*Thesaurus Theologicus*, Venice, 1762, t. 12, p. 143). Cf. Morinus, *De Penit.* lib. i. c. 19, n. 5: "Sufficit ex eorum fletibus et inchoata poenitentia probabiliter colligere Deo acceptam esse posse eorum cum Ecclesia reconciliationem et prius illi placuisse;" and *ib.* n. 3: "Tunc enim sufficit Episcopum aliquo probabili argumento colligere poenitentiam peccatoris esse tolerabilem;" finally, *ib.* n. 4: "Sufficit in poenitente animadvertere fiduciam aliquam tolerabilis conscientie."

<sup>18</sup> Migne, *ib.* col. 856.

<sup>19</sup> *ib.* col. 858.

therefore unsupported by the Holy Ghost's special graces against the relentless persecution of his passions? Not to understand the force of this argument is to be ignorant of the transforming power lodged in His sacraments by Christ Himself.

*Fourth case:* Penance was relaxed when the martyrs had given the penitent letters in which the authorities were requested to admit him to communion. It is no doubt in reference to this case that Dr. Littledale says: "The Fathers again and again urge the need of 'bringing forth fruits meet for repentance,' and when the view was first maintained that communion might be given to the lapsed without some temporal penalty being previously imposed, censured it as a dangerous innovation."<sup>20</sup>

Dr. Littledale's reference to St. Cyprian's treatise, *De Lapsis*, containing some six thousand words, is so vague that we cannot very well fasten upon any particular passage he may have had in his mind, if, indeed, he had any. At all events, the reference is pointless for the simple reason that St. Cyprian, far from maintaining that the whole penance must be performed before absolution, distinctly allows the exact opposite. It is clear to even a superficial reader that the great abuse he inveighed against was the claiming Church communion without the slightest tokens of repentance. He is not denying to the martyrs their privilege of intercession; nay, he expressly acknowledges it: *Nemo, fratres dilectissimi, nemo infamet martyrum dignitatem*,<sup>21</sup> words which Dr. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, in his posthumous edition of St. Cyprian's works, paraphrases thus: "Let no one, he says, uproot their time-honoured privilege of interceding for the lapsed, provided it be kept within the prescribed limits."<sup>22</sup> What St. Cyprian<sup>23</sup> 'censures as a dangerous innovation' is not only 'that communion might be given to the lapsed without some temporal penalty being previously imposed,' but also and especially that absolution should be given to men who had not the proper dispositions. We grant that the temporal penalty he requires is more than would be required now, because, as we have already pointed out, the fervour of that age was greater than ours; but in the very fact that he wishes to keep within

<sup>20</sup> P. 143.

<sup>21</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. 4, col. 483.

<sup>22</sup> "Nemo, inquit, convellat privilegium olim illis indultum, ut pro lapsis intercederent; modo intra terminos præfinitos sistatur" (*S. Cyp. Opera recognita a Joanne Fello*, Amstelodami, MDCC, p. 93).

<sup>23</sup> Dr. Littledale says, "the Fathers;" but his reference shows that he has generalized from St. Cyprian alone.

bounds the privileges of the martyrs we find him admitting that penances need not 'all' be 'inflicted before absolution was conferred.' For he thereby admits the granting of absolution earlier than the stricter interpretation of the then existing discipline would allow. What he will not tolerate, and what no Catholic priest of the present day would tolerate, is the arrogance of unconverted sinners relying on a ticket of admission from a martyr, "before making confession of their crime, before their conscience has been purged by the sacrifice and hand of the priest, before the resentment of an angered and threatening Lord has been appeased."<sup>24</sup>

This the Oxford translators recognised when they appended to their version of the *De Lapsis* a quaint note from Bingham, from which we borrow the following remarks about the Libellatici:—"These crafty men, for a little underhand gain, had got a trick to desire the martyrs to intercede for such as had done *little or no penance*; nay, they abused their privilege so far as peremptorily to request the admission of such, without any previous examination of their merits. And sometimes they requested the bishop not only to admit such a penitent, but all that belonged to him; which was a very uncertain and blind sort of petition, and created great envy to the bishop, when perhaps twenty or thirty or a greater number of nameless persons were included in one libel [ticket], and the bishop was forced to do a very ungrateful office, and deny them altogether."<sup>25</sup>

*Fifth case*: On those of the lapsed who, after their fall, had done or suffered something great for Christ's glory, absolution was conferred before the appointed time. This we see from St. Cyprian's answer to Bishop Caldonius. The latter had written to ask advice as to whether or no he should admit without further delay several persons who, on a second summons, had been banished for the faith, and who therefore seemed to him "to have washed away their former misdeed in that they abandon their possessions and homes, and doing penance follow Christ."<sup>26</sup> St. Cyprian fully approves of his view of the case, and adds that "they should no longer lie, so to speak, prostrate beneath the devil, who, having been banished and despoiled of their goods, have risen and begun to stand with Christ."<sup>27</sup> Doubtless in accepting banishment and confiscation these men had really done

<sup>24</sup> *De Lapsis* (Migne, *ib.* col. 479).

<sup>25</sup> Bingham, *Antiqu.* xvi. 3, § 4. See also S. Cyp. Ep. 10 (Migne).

<sup>26</sup> S. Cyp. Ep. 18 (Migne).

<sup>27</sup> *Id.* Ep. 19 (*ib.*)



very severe penance, and therefore might be said to have paid the equivalent of their penitential debt, and, in some sense, to have done all their penance; but Dr. Littledale does not hint at any loophole of equivalents or commutation, he evidently speaks of "the penances of the primitive Church" properly so called, among which, surely, exile and spoliation have no place.

*Sixth case:* The penance was shortened when the imposition of the full measure was likely to entail a schism among the faithful. Here there is no longer question, as in our second case, of the penitent and his family alone, but of his numerous supporters. On this point St. Augustine lays down a general rule in his book against Parmenian's letter. The passage (which may be found in Migne, *Pat. Lat.* vol. 43, col. 92) is too long to quote, but it is summed up by St. Augustine himself as follows:—"In such cases where, through grave dissensions, not this or that man's danger is in question, but the ruin of a multitude, severe measures must be curtailed, in order that genuine charity may help to cure greater evils.<sup>28</sup> . . . He who diligently weighs these considerations neither neglects the severity of discipline for the sake of preserving unity, nor through immoderate coercion breaks the bond of fellowship."<sup>29</sup>

In a word, the shortening of the penance is a matter of expediency; therefore *all* penances need not be completed before absolution. But we find a far stronger proof in the next and last case.

*Seventh case:* When the return of the lapsed was attended with great advantage to the Church, such as the extinction or weakening of a schism or the conversion of many souls, absolution was given before any penance at all had been performed. Thus Pope St. Cornelius, as he himself writes to St. Cyprian,<sup>30</sup> received with open arms Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, Macarius, and many others who had gone over to the Novatians, and who were now returning to the one fold. He not only forgave all the past without imposing any penance at all, but even reinstated Maximus in his former position as a priest.

In the case of Trophimus the Sovereign Pontiff was not so generous; he received him only to lay communion; but on all the followers whom Trophimus had seduced from the Church and afterwards brought back to it no penance was inflicted. And the reason is appositely given by St. Cyprian when, speaking of this

<sup>28</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. 33, col. 813.

<sup>29</sup> *Id.* t. 43, col. 94.

<sup>30</sup> Migne, *Pat. Lat.* t. 3, col. 723.

indulgence, he says: "Trophimus was readmitted, and for him the return of his brethren and the restored safety of many stood in stead of satisfaction."<sup>31</sup> The multitude of the reclaimed was considered sufficient compensation for the satisfactory penance that was condoned. Does this fully bear out Dr. Littledale's assertion that "the Fathers"—he means St. Cyprian—"censured it as a dangerous innovation, when the view was first maintained that communion might be given to the lapsed<sup>32</sup> without some temporal penalty being imposed"?

The assertion that immediately follows the words just quoted reads thus: "But they [the Fathers] held, on the other hand, that when full proof of repentance had been given by the penitent, and absolution had been received, the sin and its consequences, temporal and eternal, were blotted out by God's merciful forgiveness." The only support of this assertion is a reference to Morinus, *De Penitentia*, III. xi. Had Dr. Littledale understood the ordinary language of Catholic theologians he would not have been so utterly suicidal as to refer us to an author who in that very chapter combats Dr. Littledale's assertions, and whose entire work is one of the most conclusive refutations of the *Plain Reasons* theory of penance. The importance of having a general knowledge of an author's mind was felt by Lainez when he began by telling the bishops at the Council of Trent that he would quote from no author whose entire works he had not read. This is the heroism of honesty: it would be too much to expect of all men; but we have a right to expect that whoever bases his assertions on a reference should at least understand the context of the passage to which he is referring.

Morinus is bringing the united testimony of the Fathers to the support of the doctrine that penitents not yet justified can merit *de congruo* the remission of their sins, *i.e.* that by interior sorrow and exterior penance they can, owing to God's liberality, induce Him to grant them that forgiveness to which they have no real right, such as that which the just man has when he merits *de condigno*. This, he says,<sup>33</sup> is held by St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, and other great theologians whom Vasquez enumerates, as against some ancient scholastics who made light of the good works of sinners, and said that penitential acts did

<sup>31</sup> *Ib.* col. 773.

<sup>32</sup> Of course the "lapsed," in the technical acceptance of the term, were still more guilty than these heretics, but unless Dr. Littledale's words are taken as applying to all penitents, they can have no bearing on a proposition so general as his.

<sup>33</sup> *De Penit.* lib. 3, c. 11, n. 13.

not take effect till the penitent was justified. Nowhere does Morinus say that all the temporal consequences of sin are always blotted out by absolution, and nothing short of this, nothing less than an opinion holding that, before absolution, all penalties must be done and over, will be of any use to Dr. Littledale, for his contention is that no penalties can await absolved sin. The only passage that might, to a Protestant mind, seem to imply such a doctrine is the following sentence which opens the chapter: "Another foundation of penitential discipline, which at the beginning of this book we announced our intention of explaining, is this axiom instilled by the Fathers into the minds of all the faithful, *that the satisfactions imposed by the Church, when diligently and strenuously performed, are capable of atoning for and blotting out not only the temporal but also the eternal penalty (non tantum pœnæ temporariæ sed etiam æternæ satisfactorias esse, et expunctrices), that they purify and cleanse (purgare et emaculare) the soul, draw gently down on sinners the mercy of God and obtain from Him the pardon of crimes.*"

Observe that the author, whose italics we have given, takes care to change his form of expression when he speaks of the penal consequences of sin. He does say that the soul is cleansed, and therefore that the *sin itself* is actually "blotted out;" but when he speaks of penalties he purposely—as it would seem from the care with which the latter part of the sentence is worded and italicised—exchanges the positive for the potential form, and talks of penances as *having power to atone for and blot out* what Dr. Littledale calls "the consequences temporal and eternal." Morinus, we take it, thereby implies what he holds in common with all Catholic theologians, that this power which attaches to penance, of atoning for the temporal penalty, is not always exercised to the full even when the eternal penalty is atoned for.

However, lest anyone should be inclined to treat this view as a grammatical quibble, we do not in any way make it the basis of our argument. What we maintain is this: Even if Morinus had used the infinitives *satisfacere et expungere*, and said that penances satisfy for and "blot out" the temporal and eternal penalties, his development of this assertion in this very chapter and in other parts of his work leaves no room for doubt as to his meaning. As regards other parts of his work, it will be sufficient to refer to the passages mentioned in our second case, and to the author's copious table of contents, especially to bk. 10, ch. 10; bk. 9, ch. 5; bk. 1, ch. 15. But any one who reads carefully the

whole chapter will see plainly enough that his doctrine is that of the Church at large, which we may sum up as follows: When God forgives a grievous sin committed after baptism, the guilt (*culpa*) and the eternal debt incurred by that guilt are remitted, but there remains *per se* a debt of temporal punishment which is generally considered as a commutation of the eternal penalty. It is only in a quite imperfect and most inadequate way that the sinner can be said to atone for the guilt and the eternal penalty. The remission of this guilt and of its consequent eternal punishment constitutes the essence of forgiveness, of justification, and is really the work of God alone, who, by the very fact of forgiving the guilt, cancels the eternal debt. But the partial or—it may be, in cases of exceptionally severe penances or exceptional fervour on the part of the penitent—the entire remission of the temporal punishment is a non-essential constituent of the sacrament of penance, an integrant part of it, but yet not by any means a *sine qua non* of forgiveness. The truth is, as Morinus points out, that this temporal debt generally remains after the eternal one has been paid. It may indeed occasionally happen that the sinner's contrition is so perfect, so inflamed with charity, that God is pleased to cancel even the temporal debt; but to suppose that this is what generally happens would be to suppose that mankind is a race of heroes.

In another part of the *Plain Reasons* Dr. Littledale has a dim perception of the truth. His amusing blunder about '*Culpa*, or eternal punishment; *Pœna*, or temporal punishment'<sup>34</sup> does not affect his view of the temporal punishment. To this he takes no exception at page 104, where he hesitatingly admits 'some process of gradual improvement and fitting for heaven which goes on after death.' What is this but penalty for absolved sin?

And yet, immediately after his self-convicting reference to Morinus, Dr. Littledale goes on to say:—

The Roman Church now, habitually giving absolution *before* any kind of penance or satisfaction has been really performed, and on a mere understanding that something will be performed by the penitents, and nevertheless holding, as the Council of Trent lays down (Sess. xiv. c. 8), that satisfaction *must* be done, in order to a full remission of sins, practically disbelieves in the efficacy of her own absolutions, and teaches that penalties still await absolved sin; but that people have a choice whether they will have their purgatory, in part at least, in this

<sup>34</sup> P. 101. Cf. MONTH, July, 1881, p. 395.

world by self-torture, or await the penal sufferings beyond the grave. Hence the penances come after absolution. If Roman penances were like those of the Eastern Church, mere *remedial advice*, and not in any sense satisfaction for sin, it would not matter when they were performed; but as the received teaching is that they are part of the penal satisfaction, they ought to precede, not follow the pardon.

Dr. Littledale, in referring to the Council of Trent on the necessity of satisfaction italicises the word *must*, as if satisfaction were essential to forgiveness. But the whole tenour of the chapter he refers to shows that the Council is affirming the reasonableness of satisfaction and its necessity *de via ordinaria* in the case of the mass of penitents. The Tridentine Fathers nowhere say that satisfaction is a dogmatic necessity for all, because they knew that the sin and all its consequences can, if the sinner's heart is really torn and bruised with sorrow, be blotted out in a moment without any exterior penance at all. It is of course quite true that, generally speaking, penalties still await absolved sin, and that, generally speaking too, 'satisfaction must be done in order to a full remission of sins,' if we understand by full remission the cancelling of both the temporal and the eternal debt. But this is no proof that the 'Roman Church practically disbelieves in the efficacy of her own absolutions,' since she does not pretend to teach that the efficacy of the absolution always bears on the temporal penalty. What she does teach is the direct contradictory, as Dr. Littledale would know had he read but the first few lines of that Tridentine chapter. The first sentence ends thus: 'The holy Synod declares that it is altogether false and foreign to the Word of God, that the guilt is never remitted by the Lord without the entire penalty being forgiven.'

The teaching of the schismatic Eastern Church being no argument against us, we need not dwell on this point further than to observe that the very idea of penances is intimately bound up with satisfaction for sin, and that to reduce them to 'mere *remedial advice*' is to eat out of them their very core, their atoning power.

Again, it is hardly correct to assert that 'the Roman Church now habitually gives absolution before any kind of penance or satisfaction has been really performed.' For, to say nothing of the cases in which confessors are in the habit of deferring absolution to test the penitent's sincerity and impel him to



amend his life,<sup>35</sup> surely, that a sinner should wring from his weak will not merely true supernatural sorrow, not merely a firm purpose never again to offend and to reform his life, but over and above this the humiliating avowal of his most hidden sins to another fellow-creature, and then the determination to accept the Church's laws with regard to abstinence, fasting, prayer, and almsdeeds according to his ability, and in particular to accept, with the resolution of fulfilling, whatever penance the confessor may impose, assuredly this is really to perform some kind of penance before absolution. And without this disposition, the penitential character of which none but those who have not gone through the ordeal can deny, no penitent can be absolved.

Our answer to Dr. Littledale's conclusion that penances, being 'part of the penal satisfaction, ought to precede, not follow, the pardon,' may be thus briefly formulated from the foregoing remarks: if penances were an *essential* part of the sacrament they ought to *precede* absolution; but as they are only an *integral* part, they may, and generally do, *follow* it. Of course they are an essential 'part of the penal satisfaction,' to use Dr. Littledale's phrase, but what logical connection there is between that fact and their necessarily preceding the absolution, we cannot see. This whole clause smacks of theological acumen, but it will not stand anything like scrutiny. It simply begs the question at issue—namely, Ought satisfaction to precede absolution?

As a final reply to this question, we take one more weapon from the well-stocked armoury which Dr. Littledale has so kindly pointed out in Morinus. The latter devotes the greater part of a chapter<sup>36</sup> to a proof, drawn from the Fathers and Councils, of the following facts: The Novatian heresy was followed by greater severity in the Church's discipline with regard to penitents that had been absolved in dangerous illness and had recovered. Such penitents were ordered by the thirteenth Canon of Nicæa to perform a mitigated penance; other enactments of the Fathers and of local Councils were more severe. This severity lasted till the beginning of the twelfth century. In these facts, then, we have a constant tradition, beginning in the primitive Church, to the effect that absolved sins are to be visited with penalties. We need scarcely remind the Catholic

<sup>35</sup> Gury-Ballerini, Comp. Theol. mor. t. 2, n. 621.

<sup>36</sup> *De Penit.* lib. 10, c. 14.

reader that this tradition goes back through David, Aaron, and Moses to Adam, all of whom had to undergo very bitter penance, though 'the Lord had taken away their sin.'

The tradition of the primitive Church as against Dr. Littledale is, we venture to think, conclusive. But that is not all. Reason itself points to the same conclusion. No one who is not a Calvinist will deny that the merit of penance varies in direct proportion to the intensity of the sorrow. There ought, therefore, to be some divine provision recognizing this variety of merits. But no such provision is conceivable if all the temporal consequences are blotted out in all cases by absolution, since the guilt and the eternal punishment must disappear if there is to be any forgiveness at all. On the other hand, by admitting that the temporal penalty may remain after absolution and that its severity depends on the greater or less intensity of the penitent's sorrow, we at once secure an even-handed justice that is otherwise unattainable.

Nor is there anything repugnant to our natural sense of right and justice in the continuance of a penalty after the fault has been forgiven. If my friend, in the heat of a public discussion, slanders me in the columns of a journal, and then, in a better moment, begs my pardon, he has no right to complain if, after forgiving him, I stipulate that he should publicly withdraw his slander. I immediately restore to him my friendship; and yet he voluntarily takes on himself the burden of a penalty, because he knows that friendship may coexist with a debt of honour to his friend.

This is, analogously, what God does. When He forgives a mortal sin, the sinner ceases to be His enemy and becomes His friend, the sin is blotted out for ever, so that the guilt of that sin cannot in any sense be said to continue; but God assuredly may, as He generally does, require satisfaction for the forgiven sin committed against the unspeakable majesty of His divine honour.

Dr. Littledale proceeds to prove in his own fashion that we are Manichees. "With this error of practice, a very ancient error of doctrine, surviving from a heresy which crept early into the Church, is closely bound up, that of regarding the Christian's body, not as a sacred thing, hallowed in baptism, and so to be treated with reverence in the midst of self-denial, but as a wholly evil thing, to be crushed utterly as the soul's bitterest foe; which is rank Manichæism."

As this is nothing but assertion unsupported by a single scrap

of evidence, it might be met by a flat and bare denial—*quod gratis asseritur gratis negatur*; but we are willing to challenge Dr. Littledale to produce one respectable Catholic authority that does not regard the Christian's body "as a sacred thing, hallowed in baptism," and that treats it "as a wholly evil thing, to be crushed utterly as the soul's bitterest foe." What Catholic penitent, we should like to know, would ever macerate his flesh, did he not believe that his austerities were the preservers of that very flesh unto eternal life and its fourfold bodily glory?

As to Dr. Littledale's "absolutions lavished freely by the ten thousand without any previous tokens of real penitence being exacted," we have already seen how real are the tokens of penitence which the Church exacts. We may, however, for the sake of illustration, take an imaginary case. A Protestant clergyman, after sinning against the light in a controversial work about Catholics, in which he has persistently misrepresented them, and over and over again shifted his base in succeeding editions, without one distant allusion to a retraction,<sup>37</sup> finally yields to the fear of God's judgments, and asks to be admitted to absolution by a Catholic priest. The latter, of course, exacts an explicit withdrawal of all past slanders, and, seeing that his penitent hesitates thus bravely to repair the wrong done, the priest refuses absolution until the work of reparation is fairly under way. When at last the absolution had been earned, would Dr. Littledale venture to say that no "previous tokens of real penitence" had been exacted from this sinner? And yet no Catholic priest would fail to require such reparation.

"Thus it is the sinner," Dr. Littledale concludes, "for whom Rome makes things easy," while the saint "must lead a life of incessant torture, and is held up to admiration for it." No reply could be more terse and telling than Father Ryder's in his *Catholic Controversy*—a book, by the way, of such condensed power as to leave no room for wonder why men like Dr. Littledale are suffered by the Almighty to blaspheme what they once revered. "This complaint of the prodigal's elder brother," says Father Ryder, "has ever been found in the mouths of heretics of the Montanist and Novatian type. It must be remembered—(1) that what is made easy for the sinner is escape from Hell, whilst the difficult labours of the saints are not a point of necessity but of love. (2) That on the one hand, from him to whom much has been given much also shall be

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Father Ryder, *Catholic Controversy*, (1st ed.), pp. 168, 169.

required, and none have received so bountifully of God as the saints have; and on the other, this very love makes the hardest labours light."<sup>38</sup>

The fact is that the saintly character seems to be a realm of oggyian obscurity to Dr. Littledale's mind. In the very next section he admits that "Romanism" "continues to produce a very small minority of highly devout persons, whose lives are more conspicuously remote from worldliness of all kinds, and partake more of the heroic character, than that of pious members of other religious bodies." Now the very essence of the heroic character is the power of doing with comparative ease things that to ordinary men are inexpressibly painful; and how can the Gospel promises about the yoke made sweet and the burden light be verified, unless he whose life is "conspicuously remote from worldliness of all kinds" be found, above all other men, "to rejoice in the liberty and joy which Christ has bought" and of which Dr. Littledale strangely supposes him bereft?<sup>39</sup>

He declares such a man to be "unsound in the faith on three important particulars: (a) practically disbelieving in the forgiveness of sins"—just like all those holy Fathers whom Dr. Littledale praises<sup>40</sup> for "bringing forth fruits meet for repentance"—"(b) accounting the Blood of Christ insufficient to obtain redemption for him without his own works of penance being added to earn heaven"—just like St. Paul when he "filled up those things that were wanting of the sufferings of Christ,"<sup>41</sup> or again like St. Cyprian, whom Dr. Littledale commends for insisting on a temporary penalty before admission to Communion,<sup>42</sup> "and (c) holding that God delights in the sight of man's bodily sufferings, receiving them as an acceptable offering"—just as a mother delights in seeing her child's tooth drawn because the pain will be gone once the tooth is out.

The oracle continues—

And so not only does his body, thus maltreated, revenge itself on the soul by disturbing its balance, but he himself [the saint] comes

<sup>38</sup> P. 219.

<sup>39</sup> P. 144.

<sup>40</sup> P. 143.

<sup>41</sup> Colos. i. 24.

<sup>42</sup> Besides, could not Dr. Littledale read in the very chapter he has quoted (sess. xiv. c. 8) how the Council of Trent teaches that it is *in Christ* we make satisfaction, "bringing forth fruits worthy of penance, which take their value from Him, are offered by Him to the Father, and through Him are accepted by the Father"? Furthermore, to use Father Ryder's happy retort, "it is obvious that a system in which forgiveness is granted previous to the performance of the penance, tends not to make more but rather to make less of human satisfaction" (*Catholic Controversy*, p. 219).

round to a superstition in no practical, and in scarcely [how considerate a mitigation !] any theoretical, respect, differing from that of the Indian fakir, namely, that God is to be feared incomparably more than loved ; and that His ill-will to man is such as can only be appeased by tortures here and hereafter ; whereas the Christian doctrine is, that "the fear of the Lord is" only "the beginning of wisdom" (Psalm cxi. 10), but that "perfect love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love" (1 St. John iv. 18). So that the Church of Rome is guilty of promoting unbelief in the love of God.

That a penitential life disturbs the balance of the soul is an old calumny to which the whole history of the Church gives the lie, but which comes home with flattering unction to the adherents of an eminently respectable religion, where "decorum, benevolence, and activity,"<sup>43</sup> are the highest of virtues. Better the fakir's superstitious dread, acknowledging, as it does, the unapproachable majesty of God, than the self-satisfied presumption that knows not the claims of the Creator on the creature, and that has never understood St. Paul's cry, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death ?"<sup>44</sup>

As to God's "ill-will to man," we have shown that love can make up for all penances, that a single act of intense sorrow can do more than a lifetime of half-hearted torture ; and this is precisely why Dr. Littledale's final remarks about love casting out fear and the Church of Rome promoting unbelief in the love of God are quite beside the mark. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the fear which is cast out by love is filial, and not, according to a common interpretation,<sup>45</sup> servile fear, it still remains evident to any one acquainted, however slightly, with holy men, that spiritual joy and all-absorbing love are the very thews and sinews of their great strong lives.

This, as well as all the other errors Dr. Littledale has crammed into the three pages we have been all along examining, may be traced up to his imperfect notion of what penances were intended for. No doubt "their object was . . . to be tests of sincerity, and . . . to associate suffering with sin in the penitent's memory,"<sup>46</sup> and we hardly see the necessity of quoting two long texts of Scripture to prove what is so obvious ; but penances mean far more than this. They are, and were always meant to be, "not only a safeguard for a new life and a cure for weakness, but also a retaliation (*vindictam*) and a

<sup>43</sup> Newman's *Sermons on various occasions*, p. 33.

<sup>44</sup> Rom. vii. 24.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Estius in *Epistolæ*, in 1 Jo. iv. 18.

<sup>46</sup> *Plain Reasons*, p. 142.



chastisement for past sins."<sup>47</sup> The testimony of the Fathers on this head is so striking that Calvin was constrained to write: "I will frankly say that almost all the Fathers whose books are extant, either have erred in this matter, or have spoken too harshly and severely."<sup>48</sup> Chemnitius and the Magdeburg Centuriators also admit that almost all the Fathers acknowledge a satisfaction by which God is appeased and sins are atoned for.<sup>49</sup> The contrary is one of the darling tenets of Protestantism: Turn over a new leaf, and the past will take care of itself; why worry about washing out the old page? The unsearchable riches of Christ have covered it over. But in spite of these detractors of "Roman penances," the reasonableness of human expiation after forgiveness, even in wrongs between man and man, rises up to taunt them with treating the Most High in an off-hand way, which the meanest of men would resent.

<sup>47</sup> Conc. Trid. sess. xiv. c. 8.

<sup>48</sup> *Inst.* lib. iii. c. 4, § 38, quoted by Perrone, *De Penit.* n. 187.

<sup>49</sup> Perrone, l.c. note. Cf. *Cath. Controversy*, p. 218.

## *Chronicles of The Stage.*

---

### CHAPTER XVII.

#### STEELE MANAGER.

WITH the demise of the Queen terminated the licence of Drury Lane Theatre, and with due adroitness the managers determined to enlist in their cause Sir Richard Steele, who had suffered persecution under the Tories. As they knew the annuity was too good a thing to be left to them, and must be paid to somebody—for Collier's chances were gone—they fancied they might use it to secure more enlarged privileges. Sir Richard, ever a pleasant *débonnaire* man, heartily and kindly entered into their views, even when they made stipulations limiting his privileges in case other theatres were opened. This amiable man indeed "while we were offering to proceed stopped us short by assuring us that, as he came among us by our own invitation, he should always think himself obliged to come into any measures for our ease and service; that to be a burthen to our industry would be more disagreeable to him than it could be to us; and as he had always taken a delight in his endeavours for our prosperity, he should be still ready on our own terms to continue them. Every one who knew Sir Richard Steele in his prosperity (before the effects of his good-nature had brought him to distresses) knew that this was his manner of dealing with his friends in business. Another instance of the same nature will immediately fall in my way. When we proposed to put this agreement into writing, he desired us not to hurry ourselves, for that he was advised, upon the late desertion of our actors, to get our licence (which only subsisted during pleasure) enlarged into a more ample and durable authority, and which he said he had reason to think would be more easily obtained if we were willing that a patent for the same purpose might be granted to him only, for his life and

three years after, which he would then assign over to us. This was a prospect beyond our hopes, and what we had long wished for."

The patent was "settled" carefully by eminent counsel, Northy and Lechmere; and these he had consulted not so much for the security of the thing as from fear it would injure or interfere with Rich's property. He was moderate enough also to ask it merely during his own life-time and for three years in addition. These incidents are characteristic of this worthy man.

This privilege was dated October 18, 1714, and by it "we did give and grant unto Sir Richard Steele, Knt., Mr. Robert Wilks, Mr. Colley Cibber, Mr. Thomas Doggett, and Mr. Barton Booth, full power, licence, and authority to form, constitute, and establish a company of comedians, now acting at the theatre in Drury Lane." Steele was described as "Supervisor" of Drury Lane Theatre. The patent followed three months later, and was dated January 19, 1715. These great favours, which he took rather lightly, he chiefly owed to his great patron, Walpole, who was then in office, with the more subsidiary aid of the owner of Blenheim. The incidents attending the gift were most gratifying, Parker, in compliment to Sir Richard, declining his fee. As Sir Richard was leaving town in a hurry, he signed a carelessly drawn document, which, it was found, transferred to him a share in the property as well as the patent. This he not only took no advantage of, but agreed on his return to be charged with a large sum.

This secured, the patentees now were "emboldened" to lay out large sums on mounting pieces, £600 being expended on a revival, the dresses alone costing that sum. This introduction of Steele was, as we have just seen, a matter of favour or partiality, and due to the interest of a powerful nobleman, the Duke of Marlborough, whom Steele had gained by a happy repartee which had been repeated to the Duke. Much too was owing to his own great services to the dynasty, for, as he wrote to his lady sometime in 1717, "you are witness that I have served the royal family with an unreservedness due only to Heaven. But I am now (I thank my brother Whigs) not possessed of twenty shillings from the favour of the Court. The playhouse it had been barbarity to deny at the players' request, therefore I do not account it a favour. . . . You will find I have got so much constancy and fortitude as to live my

own way wherever I am. To provide for and do you good is all my ambition." In these days the Duke of Bolton was Lord Chamberlain, and favoured Steele.

A pleasant picture is given of one of the new manager's visits to his patron at Blenheim, where he found himself a guest with Bishop Hoadley and others, when private theatricals were got up and a play of Shakespeare's performed. When they were leaving the house, they found all the servants drawn up in two lines in the hall, waiting the expected "vails," as was the custom. Sir Richard turned to the Bishop and asked him: "Do you give money to all these fellows in laced coats and ruffles?" "I have not enough," said the Bishop. On which Sir Richard addressed them, declaring that as he had found them men of taste, he invited them all to Drury Lane Theatre, to any play they might choose to bespeak."

The Lord Chamberlain presently went out of office, and then came a very serious change in the spirit of the Court. He was succeeded by the Duke of Newcastle, who desired to have all persons under his rule, and tried to introduce despotic regulations and more effectual control. Hitherto he appears to have been friendly to Steele, who styles him "his most honoured lord and patron." Almost his first step was to summons his theatrical dependants before him, and persuade them to surrender their patent and accept one of less extent. Steele thus relates what took place: "When your Grace," he says, "came to be Chamberlain, from a generous design of making every office and authority the better for your wearing, your Grace was induced to send for me and the other sharers, and in an absolute manner offered us a licence and demanded a resignation of the patent, which I presumed as absolutely to refuse. This refusal I made in writing, and petitioned the King for his protection in the grant which he has given me. The matter rested thus for many months, and the next molestation we received was an order to close.

Matters were allowed to take their course for a time, but the Chamberlain seems to have resented the opposition of his wishes. An occasion for interference with the comedians was found when an adaptation of Moliere's *Tartuffe*, by Cibber, under the name of *The Non-Juror*, was presented with extraordinary success. It was obvious that this was in the interest of the Whigs and their Government, and intended to bring ridicule on the Tories. Yet the Chamberlain affected to see a contrary design, and as

it caused much heat and confusion among the factious, he picked out Cibber, who played the part with spirit, and sent an order "silencing" him. Steele tells what followed: "Without any cause assigned, or preface declaring by what authority, a noble lord sends a message, directed to Sir Richard Steele, Mr. Wilks, and Mr. Booth, to dismiss Mr. Cibber, who for some time submitted to a disability of appearing on the stage during the pleasure of one that had nothing to do with it. When this lawless will and pleasure was changed, a very frank declaration was made, that all the mortification put upon Mr. Cibber was intended only as a remote beginning of evils which were to affect the patentee. I presumed to write to your Grace against it, and expressed my sorrow that you would give me no better occasion of showing my duty to you but by bearing oppression from you. This produced a message from your secretary, 'to forbid me ever to write, speak, or visit you more.'" Steele's answer was "almost in these words," begging of the messenger to note his manner, voice, and gesture. "If he had not used phrases that spoke of his mortification and sorrow, he hoped he would supply them. At the same time you may truly say that if any other man were Chamberlain, and should send me such a message, my reply should be as haughty as it is now humble." Soon after he heard that Mr. Booth had been sent for, that his own patent should be tested in a court of law, and was further "threatened with a sign manual" which would disable his defence. To this the Chamberlain added his own edict:

Whereas his Majesty has thought fit by his letters of revocation, dated January 23, 1720, for divers weighty reasons therein contained, to revoke his royal licence: for the effectual prevention of any future misbehaviour, in obedience to his Majesty's commands I do by virtue of my office hereby discharge you, the said managers and comedians, from further acting. January 25, 1720.

*To the gentlemen managing the company of comedians at the theatre in Drury Lane in Covent Garden, and to all the comedians and actors there.*

Thus, as Steele points out sarcastically, whereas his Majesty had expressed himself with reserve and care that nothing should hurt his poor subject but what the law allowed, the Chamberlain had supplied the defect. This cruel act of oppression was almost his ruin. He gave way to the most bitter indignation—publishing his wrongs, founding a periodical, *The Theatre*, to ventilate his complaints. The Lord Chamberlain he pursued



with vituperation, even apologizing for the more obsequious and amiable tone in which he had first addressed "his honoured lord and patron" when making his complaint. "The sense of the Chamberlain's former patronage made me write him a letter in the theatre much below the justice of my cause." "Give me," he says, "but the name of your adviser, that is to say your lawyer. When I know who has thus made your Grace thus injure the best servant and the best master that ever man had, I will teach him the difference between law and justice. . . . He is an agent of Hell. Such a man for a larger fee would lend a dark lanthorn to a murderer. I shall so far imitate him, as to be within the law when I am endeavouring to starve him." The personage, who thus excited his fury, was Serjeant Pengelly, who had merely discharged a professional duty. Him he thus assailed with coarse language and very undignified abuse. He was on safer ground when he complained of the vindictive animosity of the Chamberlain, who gave no reason for his hostility, but declared openly "he would ruin Steele," which, he protested, was like the character in the comedy who "valued himself on his activity in tripping up cripples." His loss he estimated at £600 a year for life—

Modestly estimated at . . . . .	£6,000
The three years after my life . . . . .	£1,800
My share in the scene stock . . . . .	£1,000
The profit of acting my own plays . . . . .	£1,000
	<hr/>
	£9,800

No less than sixty families, he urged, were dependent on him and the house. "The thing itself," he went on, "is but a shop to work in, and receives nothing from the Crown. If I had been laceman, saddler, or shoemaker to the Crown by patent, I could not have been dispossessed but by due course of law."

A more important question to us was the legality of the proceedings. He quoted the opinions of counsel, that the patent was not to be shaken. Pemberton, Northy, and Parker had been, he said, consulted by those who succeeded Davenant—in February, 1703—and they had held that the patent was "a fee." But the truth was, he did not touch the question, which was the unquestioned power of the Crown to suspend the exercise of the patent (it will have been seen that the Chamberlain affected to be dealing with a licence only), and which was essential to the

very power of granting it. It is enough to state this to show that the position could be controverted; and the King possessed of such exceptional and unlimited power, could not be supposed to divest himself of it.

The suspension lasted only a few weeks, when the comedians made their submission, and agreed to accept a licence. Steele, however, was not forgiven, and his patent was ignored. The theatre was allowed to be reopened on the 28th of January, and on the 4th of March we learn that "the King's company of Drury Lane, belonging to the playhouse in Drury Lane, were sworn at the Lord Chamberlain's office in Whitehall, pursuant to an order occasioned by their acting in obedience to his Majesty's licence, lately granted, exclusive of a patent formerly obtained by Sir Richard Steele. That the tenor of the oath was that, as his Majesty's servants, they should act subservient to the Lord Chamberlain, Vice-Chamberlain, and Gentleman Usher in Waiting." Nothing more humiliating than the terms of this submission could be—even a Gentleman Usher in Waiting might control them. Strange to say, Cibber, though dealing minutely with the period, makes no allusion to his own suspension or to the withdrawal of the licence, which must have been their destruction.

It will be interesting to consider how the theatre was conducted, and what entertainment was given. It was now that Rich and his son—the former, however, dying shortly after his theatre was opened—brought out that extraordinary form of entertainment known as the English Pantomime. These were first introduced with due magnificence at the Lincoln's Inn Field's Theatre, and drew the town—the harlequin being by "Mr. Lun," a stage name for Rich. The other house, for all their classical professions, had to follow suit, for which Cibber makes rather lame excuse: "I have upon several occasions already observed that when one company is too hard for another, the lower in reputation has always been forced to exhibit some new-fangled soppery to draw the multitude after them. . . . Dancing therefore was now the only weight in the opposite scale, and as the new theatre sometimes found their account in it, it could not be safe for us wholly to neglect it. To give even dancing therefore some improvement, and to make it something more than motion without meaning, the fable of *Mars and Venus* was formed into a connected presentation of dances in character, wherein the passions were so happily

expressed, and the whole story so intelligibly told, by a mute narration of gesture only, that even thinking spectators allowed it both a pleasing and a rational entertainment, though, at the same time, from our distrust of its reception, we durst not venture to decorate it with any extraordinary expense of scenes or habits; but upon the success of this attempt it was rightly concluded that if a visible expense in both were added to something of the same nature, it could not fail of drawing the town proportionably after it. From this original hint then (but every way unequal to it) sprung forth that succession of monstrous medlies—that have so long infested the stage, and which arose upon one another alternately at both houses outvying in expense, like contending bribes on both sides at an election, to secure a majority of the multitude." Thus we find *Dr. Faustus* as a great attraction, in which, we are told, "tricks were executed in a very surprising manner, and the last grand scene is superior in magnificence to anything that has ever yet appeared on the British stage. 'No money under the full price will be taken during the time of the play.' At Lincoln's Inn Fields there was a rival pantomime, *Jupiter and Europa*, in which were Pierrot, Punch, and Columbine. The clown by Spiller. Also, a day later, *Dr. Faustus*. Harlequin by Mr. Lun. 'To prevent any obstruction in the movement of the scenes, no person can be admitted behind scene.'"

Steele himself, however, had to wait another year for redress. On May 2, 1721, the *Daily Post* mentioned a rumour "that Sir Richard Steele is restored to his place of comptroller of Drury Lane." On the 18th of May he was actually reinstated. This was owing to the significant circumstance of the influence of his patron, Walpole, who, we find, had become Chancellor of the Exchequer only three or four weeks before.

---

## CHAPTER XVIII.

### INCIDENTS OF MANAGEMENT.

ONE of the most satisfactory features of the system, for the management of both houses, was the arrangement by which they were enabled to exercise an almost despotic control over the players. One of their covenants was in the true spirit of the modern trades' union. No deserter was to be taken into

service at the other house, and no one was to engage at one house without leave of the other. By this plan an article of agreement was made April 12, 1722, "between Sir Richard Steele, Robert Wilks, Colley Cibber, and Barton Booth, of the one part, and John Rich and Christopher Mozier Rich of the other. Whereas the former are the present masters or managers of the company that play at Drury Lane, in the parishes of St. Martin-in-the-Fields and St. Paul, Covent Garden, and the latter are masters of the company that play at Lincoln's Inn Fields, it was agreed reciprocally between these parties that from September to June each shall not receive or engage the actors of the other, under a penalty of £20 for each lapse." An "inventory" was attached, with a schedule of the players.

No. I.—*Men*: Mr. Lacy Ryan, Mr. James Quin, Mr. R. Diggs, Mr. Hewlet, Mr. J. Hall, Mr. Hildred Bullock, Mr. W. Bullock, jun., Mr. J. Rogers, Mr. Orphire, Mr. Rakehaw, Mr. Timothy Buck, Mr. Pinkethman, jun., Mr. J. Leigh, Mr. S. Smith, M. J. Lequerie (singer), Mr. Lully (dancer), Mr. Palling (dancer), Mr. Newhouse (dancer), Mr. Duffield (dancer), Mr. W. Chetwood (prompter).

*Women*: Mrs. Ann Seymond, Mrs. J. Bullock, Mrs. Letitia Cross, Mrs. Jane Eggleton, Mrs. Spillar, Mrs. Rogier, Mrs. Anne Stone, Mrs. Sulick, Mrs. Marylook, Mrs. Parloe, Mrs. Hutten, Mrs. Frances, Mrs. Goodman, Mrs. Henriale Bullock (dancer).

No. II.—*Men*: Mr. J. Mills, Mr. B. Johnson, Mr. W. Pinkethman, Mr. H. Norris, Mr. D. Miller, Mr. Griffin, Mr. T. Bickerstaff, Mr. J. Thurmond, sen., Mr. J. Shond, Mr. C. Shepherd, Mr. C. Williams, Mr. W. Wilks, jun., Mr. J. Thurmond, jun., M. Dunoyer (dancer), Mr. J. Bowman, Mr. R. Cross, Mr. M. Birkhead, Mr. J. Bates, Mr. Wetherel, Mr. R. Wetherel, jun., Mr. Harper, Mr. Steed, Mr. J. Corey, Mr. W. Mills, jun., Mr. P. Watson, Mr. J. Wray, Mr. T. Wilson, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Theo. Cibber, Mr. Symonds, Mr. Boval (dancer).

*Women*: Mrs. Anne Oldfield, Mrs. Mary Porter, Mrs. S. Thurmond, Mrs. M. Bicknell, Mrs. E. Horton, Mrs. E. Younger, Mrs. C. Baker, Mrs. Hen. Moor, Mrs. Willis, sen., Mrs. Willis, jun., Mrs. Bullock (dancer), Mrs. Tenoe, Mrs. Bowman, Mrs. Heron, Mrs. Campbell, Mrs. Markham, Mrs. Tent.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, in November, 1722, we find Mr. John Rich despatching a notification to the managers of the house,<sup>2</sup> "Wilks,

<sup>1</sup> British Museum, Add. MSS. 2,201.

<sup>2</sup> Described by the late Mr. Bullock as an autograph of extraordinary rarity, adding that he had never seen one of Rich, the founder of English pantomime, before. It will be seen from the next specimen that it is not quite so rare as he thought.

Cibber, and Booth, informing them that he has entertained in his service as an actor, Mr. John Hipplesley." The managers, however, found it necessary for their own protection to make a formal contract with Sir R. Steele, to the effect that "whereas the Lord Chamberlain did lately direct that he should not be paid his fourth share, it is now ordered that he should receive it. But that if on any future occasion the Chamberlain should divert the share, he agrees now not to claim it."<sup>3</sup>

In April, 1721, we find the aggrieved Steele writing in his diary that he was "resolved to pursue very warmly my being restored to the government of the Theatre Royal, which is my right, under the title of *Governor of the Royal Company of Comedians*, and from which I have been violently dispossessed by the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's household, upon a frivolous pretence of jurisdiction in his office, which he has been persuaded to assert. This I take to have been instigated by the late secretaries. But if it could have entered into my thoughts that it was possible men could fail of placing the same value (as a security against a contingent demand) which I gave for it, your answer had not been at all what it was. You have been the chief engine in ensnaring me into a concession which I should have been ashamed to own, before you had the resolution to deny so equitable a demand as I made to you. But as it now is, besides the folly of giving to men richer than myself, I have done it to those who have no regard for me, but as a tool and a screen against others who want to treat you all, and forbear only because of my relation to you, which shall not be very long, for I have it in my power to get rid of my enemies much more easily than I can have common justice of my friends. This is evident in the monstrous hardness of denying the governor of the house, as you shall find I am; the superfluity of his income, which is liable to no demand or pretence but that of, sir, your most humble servant,  
—RICHARD STEELE."

To Booth he wrote (on the same day and even on the same sheet of paper) that, as he was not so intimate with him as with the two others, he did not expect the same tenderness he had hoped for from them. He asked bitterly if he had taken counsel "whether a partner who had paid the mortgagee off his part, and given the partners in pure benevolence a thousand pounds,

<sup>3</sup> These "articles of agreement," duly engrossed, are to be seen, framed and hung in the British Museum for the benefit of the curious.



as a title to their taking his share of the estate, security against the mortgage-deeds unjustly detained from him."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> On the back of this part are some loose calculations on "the neat profits" of the theatre, but crossed out. They are for the year 1721. The partners were reckoning up his share.

	3-4ths.	The 4th part.	The 4th of the 5th.
Sept. 23	£94 10s.	£31 10s.	£4 4s.
Oct. 7	84 0	28 0	4 4
21	108 15	36 5	5 9 9d.
28	81 0	27 0	4 1 6
Nov. 4	114 0	38 0	5 14
11	99 9	33 0	4 19
18	117 0	39 0	5 17
25	150 0	50 0	7 10
Dec. 2	162 0	54 0	8 2

## NEAT PROFITS FOR 1721.

Month and day.	Total profit.	4th part.	The 4th of the 5th.
Sept. 23	£126 0s.	£31 10s.	£6 6s.
Oct. 7	112 0	28 0	5 12
21	145 0	36 5	7 5
28	108 0	27 0	5 8
Nov. 4	152 0	38 0	7 12
11	132 0	33 0	6 12
18	156 0	39 0	7 16
25	200 0	50 0	10 0
Dec. 2	216 0	54 0	10 16
	£1,347 0	£336 15	£67 7

## PLAYHOUSE ACCOUNT, 1723.

Nov. 2	...	...	...	£21
7	...	...	...	29
16	...	...	...	21
23	...	...	...	13
30	...	...	...	58
Dec. 7	...	...	...	53
14	...	...	...	45
21	...	...	...	67
28	...	...	...	13
Jan. 4	...	...	...	18
11	...	...	...	0
18	...	...	...	0
25	...	...	...	0
Feb. 1	...	...	...	20
8	...	...	...	30
15	...	...	...	8
22	...	...	...	12
29	...	...	...	27
March 7	...	...	...	24
14	...	...	...	42
21	...	...	...	15

After the suit was heard, the issue of it was this: "That Sir Richard not having made any objection to what we had charged for management for three years together, and as our proceedings had been all transacted in open day, without any clandestine intention of fraud, we were allowed the sums in dispute, above mentioned; and Sir Richard not being advised to appeal to the Lord Chancellor, both parties paid their own costs, and thought it their mutual interest to let this be the last of their lawsuits."

The idea of self-importance which the actor exhibited during this period is shown by the following advertisement issued by one of reputation, and belonging to the "old set," namely, Boheme. At the bottom of the bill for April 27, 1723, he announced: "Whereas I am informed that there is a report about the town that the managers of Drury Lane have lately endeavoured to seduce me from Lincoln's Inn Fields, I think myself obliged, in justice to the said managers, to declare that the said report is entirely false; and do hereby acknowledge that I first made overtures to be received into their company, for reasons at that time to myself best known, and further that it was never proposed by either of the said managers or myself that I should quit Lincoln's Inn Fields without six months' warning given to supply my part, and a discharge in writing from the managers of Lincoln's Inn Fields." Spiller nearly at the same time announced a benefit "for myself and my creditors."

But with all this good promise and good material, discord was now to break out between the working managers and Sir Richard Steele, whose extravagance, and at the same time indifference to the business of the house, together led to quarrels. For the latter they found a sort of compensation, in charging him for their services, as we find from the following, dated September 12, 1724: "We think it reasonable to allow one pound thirteen shillings and fourpence per diem to each of us whose names are under written, in consideration of our constant attendance, management, and acting." Signed by Colley Cibber, B. Booth, and Robert Wilks. Steele became bitter and furious. In some of his manuscript letters, still preserved, he gives vent to his rage.

In 1724 we find the managers writing in the most desponding strain as to their venture, wishing that Steele would come to town, now desiring him "to make all speed to us. Our

audiences decrease daily, and these low entertainments, which you and we so heartily despise, draw the numbers, whilst we act only to the few who are blest with common sense. Though the opera is worn, yet it draws better than before, and some persons of distinction have engaged French comedians to come over to the Haymarket. Thus, while there are three playhouses exhibiting nonsense of different kinds against us, it is impossible we should subsist much longer. Both the Courts have forsaken us. All we can do is to make the best of a losing game, and part from the whole on the best terms we can. No person living but ourselves is sensible of the low state we are reduced to, therefore we need not observe to you how very needful it is to keep the secret. There are several persons of fortune that we have reason to believe would be glad to purchase our interests, and put it on the footing of the opera by fixing the direction into an academy. . . . P.S.—Our profits were ever more than double to what they have been this year, and we are very far from any hopes of their growing better. Our proposal of parting with our interests will still leave room for any of us to adventure upon this new scheme in what proportion we please."

After these troubles the knight, who had grown old, withdrew from the town. Victor, a well known man about the theatres, gives in a few words a pleasing little sketch of him. He retired, he says to Hereford. "I am told he retained his cheerful sweetness of temper to the last, and would often be carried out in a summer's evening where the country lads and lasses were assembled at their rural sports, and with his pencil give an order on his agent (a mercer, who was receiver of the rents of an encumbered estate he had with his wife) for a new gown to the best dancer."

When the play of *The Coronation* was first performed, in 1723, at Drury Lane, a very serious catastrophe had almost occurred. A great crowd had assembled when "an alarm of fire was raised, from ignorance or malice, which threw the audience into a dreadful consternation for about half an hour." A few days later appeared a reassuring explanation of the means ready at the theatre for extinguishing a conflagration. Captain Shaw of our day might have written it. "It is the proper business of several persons, with several inspectors over them, to fire and light all the lamps in and about the playhouse, in large candlesticks and broad stands made of tin, in so safe a

manner that should any candle swail, and fall out of its socket, no danger could attend it. Large cisterns of water above stairs and below, and hand engines are always ready, and the carpenters, scene men, and servants are employed in such numbers during the whole time of representation, and disposed in order, every light in the whole theatre is in view of some of the servants."

Frederick Reynolds entertained at Chiselhurst, about the beginning of the century, an old gentleman and his wife who had been at the Court of George the Second. He gave him a curious sketch of a royal visit to the playhouse about this time.

GEORGE THE SECOND AT THE PLAY.

His Majesty arriving at the theatre some few minutes after his time, the arbitrary audience (who will rarely allow even a regal actor to keep the stage business waiting) received him with some very hasty rude marks of their disapprobation. The King, taken by surprise, for a moment expressed both chagrin and embarrassment; but, with a prompt recollection, he skilfully converted all their anger into applause. He drew forth his watch, and having pointed to the hand, and shown it to the Lord in Waiting, he advanced to the front of the box, and directing the attention of the audience to his proceedings, he deliberately beat the misleading timekeeper against the box—thus proving he was a great actor, and deserving of the full houses he always brought.

The play commenced and concluded with its usual success; and no other unusual circumstance occurred until the middle of the after-piece, where a centaur was introduced, who having to draw a bow, and therewith shoot a formidable adversary, through some confusion, erring in his aim, the arrow entered the royal box and grazed the person of the King. The audience rose in indignation against the perpetrator of this atrocious attempt, and seemed preparing to revenge the outrage, when at that moment the whole *fore part* of the centaur fell on its face among the lamps, in consequence of the carpenter, who played the *posterior*, rushing from his concealment with the most trembling humility in order to assure his Majesty, and all present, that he was no party in this *treasonable* transaction.

At these words arose and advanced "the *very head and front* of the offence," and, likewise endeavouring to exculpate himself, energetically addressed the audience. The noisy discussion and the ridiculous criminations and vindications which ensued between these two grotesque, half dressed, *half human*, beings, so amply rewarded George the Second and the spectators for the previous alarm, that loud and involuntary shouts of laughter from every part of the house acknowledged that the centaur's *head and tail* were incomparably the most amusing performers of the evening.

"In the year 1721 Mr. Rich obtained leave for a party of the Guards to do duty at his house like the other, and that gave it the name of the Theatre Royal. Whereas the fact is that Mr. Rich was in the possession of a royal patent at the death of his father; and the accident of obtaining the Guards to do duty at his theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields, in 1721, was occasioned by a riot then committed there by a drunken set of young men of quality, which shut up that theatre for seven or eight days. As the particulars of that riot are to the honour of the manager and the actors, I shall relate it. A certain noble earl, who was said (and with some degree of certainty, as he drank usquebaugh constantly at his waking) to have been in a state of drunkenness for six years, was behind the scenes at the close of a comedy (*The Beggars' Opera*), and seeing one of his companions on the other side, he crossed over the stage among the performers, and was accordingly hissed by the audience. I was standing by Mr. Rich on the side the noble lord came over to, and on the uproar in the house at such an irregularity, the manager said, 'I hope your lordship will not take it ill if I give orders to the stage-door keeper not to admit you any more.' On his saying that, my lord saluted Mr. Rich with a slap on the face, which he immediately returned; and his lordship's face being round and fat, made his cheek ring with the force of it. Upon this spirited return, my lord's drunken companions collected themselves directly, and Mr. Rich was to be put to death; but Quin, Ryan, Walker, &c., stood forth in defence of the manager, and a grand scuffle ensued, by which the gentlemen were all drove out at the stage-door into the street. They then sallied into the boxes with their swords drawn, and broke the sconces, cut the hangings (which were gilt leather finely painted), and continued the riot there till Mr. Quin came round with a constable and watchmen, and charged them every one into custody. They were carried before Justice Hungerford, who then lived in that neighbourhood, and all bound over to answer the consequences; but they were soon persuaded by their wiser friends to make up this matter, and the manager got ample redress. The King, being informed of the whole affair, was highly offended, and ordered a guard to attend that theatre as well as the other, which is continued to this day."

The three managers, however, had used all their exertions to bring about a reform, both behind the curtain and in the audiences. "From the visible errors of former managements,"



says one of them, "we had at last found the necessary means to bring our private laws and orders into the general observance and approbation of our society. Diligence and neglect were under an equal eye: the one never failed its reward, and the other, by being very rarely excused, was less frequently committed. You are now to consider us in our height of favour, and so much in fashion with the politer part of the town, that our house every Saturday seemed to be the appointed assembly of the first ladies of quality. Of this too the common spectators were so well apprized, that for twenty years successively on that day we scarce ever failed of a crowded audience, for which occasion we particularly reserved our best plays, acted in the best manner we could give them. Among our many necessary reformatations, what a little preserved to us the regard of our auditors was the decency of our clear stage, from whence we had now for many years shut out those idle gentlemen who seemed more delighted to be pretty objects themselves than capable of any pleasure from the play, who took their daily stands where they might best elbow the actor and come in for their share of the auditors' attention. In many a laboured scene of the warmest humour and of the most affecting passion, have I seen the best actors disconcerted while these buzzing musquitos have been fluttering round their eyes and ears. How was it possible an actor, so embarrassed, should keep his impatience from entering into that different temper which his personated character might require him to be possessed of?"

---

## CHAPTER XIX.

MR. HIGHMORE.

IT must be noted that the managers not long before their retirement succeeded in getting a renewal of their patent for twenty-one years. Cibber does not touch on the immediate causes of the break up, or mention that Booth had disposed of his share of the patent. Victor, who had been now for many years intimate with the managers, tells us the story. "It was natural," he says, "for a man who, like Booth, had contracted a love for money, to turn his thoughts upon a purchaser, and the following lucky accident presented itself. Just before the death of Mr. Wilks, the late John Highmore, Esq., a gentleman possessed of an estate of £800 a year, offered himself (by way

of frolic for one night) to play the part of Lothario, prompted to that extravagance by a wager at White's of £100, which he had made with the late Lord Limerick. The managers readily accepted the proposal, and, besides the benefit of the greatest receipt they had ever known to a stock play (as the stage was crowded), Mr. Highmore made them a present of the rich suit he made up for the character. There are many persons now living who saw him on the stage, can bear witness with me, that this unhappy gentleman had not one requisite for an actor, and yet if his vanity would have suffered him to have ended his frolic with his first night's performance, there were numbers of his auditors who would never have been persuaded but his acting of Lothario was superior to Booth's! . . . Mr. Booth, who was a man of quick penetration, soon fixed his eye upon this gentleman for a purchaser of his share of the new patent, and from my intimacy with both those gentlemen I was the person who had the misfortune to be singled out by Mr. Booth to make the proposal to Mr. Highmore. As I then thought it doing a mutual service to both parties, without the least hesitation (one morning when alone with him at his own house) I told him Mr. Booth had requested me to inform him of his desire to part with his share of the new patent, by which the purchaser would become a manager and third sharer with Mr. Cibber and the Widow Wilks, who had just then appointed the late Mr. Ellis, the painter, to be her deputy. I well remember Mr. Highmore had no sooner heard the proposal than he replied: 'Ah, ha! and have they thought of it at last. I really expected to have heard from some of them on this subject.' This reply to the proposal will, I hope, convince my reader that no arguments were necessary to persuade him into the purchase. To be brief, an appointment was then made for an interview with Mr. Booth on that business, at which I was present, and after two or three meetings the large sum of £2,500 was agreed to be paid for *one half* only of Mr. Booth's third share of his patent. £5,000 was demanded for the whole share. Mr. Highmore (desirous to be engaged) thought it safest to purchase only half the share, but bargained for all the power, as he was to act for Mr. Booth in the management. As the patentees had, for the preceding twenty years, enjoyed such uninterrupted success, and their shares had amounted to £1,500, and never less than £1,000, a year, and as this was (fortunately for Booth), the first sale that had been offered, it was no doubt

owing to that circumstance alone that so extravagant a price was given; because in less than twelve months Mr. Highmore purchased Mr. Cibber's whole third share for three thousand guineas, which was but £650 more than Booth got for his half! Thus Mr. Highmore paid the sum of £5,650 for one share and a half, which was just half the power of the patent! He should before that have made this timely and useful resolution, that he advanced that great sum to buy out the remaining two eminent men, whose abilities in their profession were the sole cause of the success that attended their theatre! I remember, when Booth's purchase-money was paid by Mr. Highmore, and the transaction publicly known, Mr. Cibber seemed greatly hurt at the thoughts of meeting Mr. Highmore and Mr. Ellis in the office of managers, to consult with and settle the business of the theatre; and said, to avoid the importance of one and the ignorance of the other, he would have his deputy too, and accordingly invested his son Theophilus to sit down with those gentlemen in his place, who wanted nothing but power to be as troublesome as any young man living. However, by his great activity and superior knowledge in the business, he got up a new pantomime entertainment called the *Harlot's Progress* (a story just then invented and made popular by that great genius, Hogarth), which was much approved, and brought a deal of money to the theatre. By his means Mr. Highmore was a gainer at the close of the season; but that profit, and the disgust he conceived to the behaviour of young Cibber, determined him to treat with the father for his share of the patent, which second purchase very soon proved fatal to Mr. Highmore. Soon after followed Booth's death, and his widow very wisely made the best bargain she could for her remaining sixth share with Mr. Giffard, who was then master of the new theatre in Goodman's Fields, for which I have been told she got £1,500. This second purchase of Mr. Highmore's was at the commencement of the season 1733, and in that situation did that gentleman enter into the second season of his theatrical government, with only Mr. Ellis, as agent for the Widow Wilks, to aid and assist him; for Mr. Giffard had at that time a company of his own to manage at a remote end of the town, and made his purchase in Drury Lane patent (I heard him say) as a good stake in an establishment he thought much surer than his own. I believe I may venture to affirm that two weeks had not passed of Mr. Highmore's government in the theatre before a revolt began

to show itself among the capital performers, which, I am sorry to say, was spirited up by Mr. Theophilus Cibber, the son of the late patentee, who had a few days before, received that large sum of money for his property there; and so dexterous was this young captain, that he instantly got all the seniors and persons of any consequence in the company to enlist under his banner: old Mills, Johnson, Miller, Griffin, Harper, &c. Mrs. Heron was at that time at the head of the female list, and in the possession of the late Mrs. Oldfield's parts. She, and all the women, went with the revolvers, but the late Mrs. Horton and Mrs. Clive; and the little theatre in the Haymarket was fitted up and decorated with the greatest expedition, where they opened with the comedy of *Love for Love*, to an elegant, crowded audience. The violence of this transaction was at this juncture so notorious that it immediately threw the whole town into party! The friends to the revolvers urged that the actors were a free people, and not to be sold with the patent, as slaves with a plantation in the West Indies! For, it must be here observed, that there were no articles subsisting between the managers and actors as has been the custom ever since. Mr. Cibber tells us, in page 363, 'We neither asked actors, nor were desired by them, to sign any written agreement whatsoever; the rates of their respective salaries were only entered in our daily pay-roll, which plain record every one looked upon as good as city security.' Thus, when Mr. Highmore made the purchase of that large share of the patent, the performers (as appears above) were free to choose their master, or set up for themselves, even without a licence, if not contrary to the laws of the land; and that must hereafter be inquired into. I must own I was heartily disgusted with the conduct of the family of the Cibbers on this occasion, and had frequent and violent disputes with father and son whenever we met! It appeared to me something shocking that the son should immediately render void and worthless what the father had just received £3,150 for, as a valuable consideration. I remember in these disputes the general observation was, what business had a *gentleman* to make the purchase?"

Highmore seems to have been as reckless and extravagant as the manager that came after him, and there is a rare etching of Hogarth's, portraying a sort of practical joke played off at his expense by his friends, and significant of his habits.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The plate was suppressed after ten impressions had been taken. It is clear that this suggested a corresponding incident in one of Foote's dramas.

Rich himself little dreamed that he was on the eve of producing one of the greatest, and for that time enormous, successes of the English stage, beside furnishing a passage in the history of English literature. He was also to strike out a new form of entertainment which was at once to take root and bring profit, at a certain season, for a full century and a half. These two leading strokes were *The Beggar's Opera*, and the introduction of pantomime.

---

CHAPTER XX.

## COVENT GARDEN THEATRE.

WE are now arrived at one of the important eras in theatrical history, when a new theatre was to be established, destined to share with that of Drury Lane the increasing public interest in the drama. The situation chosen was within view of the other: and the rivalry was likely to prove dangerous. Drury Lane was now an old, and old-fashioned, house, also the first experiment in theatre building; so there was ample room for a new experiment, guided by taste and enterprize. These Rich, who came of a clever, speculative, and energetic family, was ready to supply. The first step was to find the money; but this was a matter of no difficulty. In January, 1731, we learn that "a subscription to aid Mr. Rich in building a new theatre in Covent Garden, amounting to £6,000, was subscribed. It was to be speedily begun by that ingenious architect, James Shepherd, Esq., his draught being very much approved of already. The theatre in Lincoln's Inn Fields it was proposed to sell to the Commissioners of Stamps for a new office."

Almost at once the undertaking was commenced, and the progress of the workmen watched with much curiosity. By July it had been pushed forward with great energy, and numbers of the nobility resorted thither daily to look on at the works. In September an accident occurred as they were raising one of the beams for the roof: one man was killed, and others much injured. But, as may be conceived, this promise of success must have alarmed the rival house. As we have seen, on the death of Steele a new licence was readily obtained. His patent, by its terms, was to run for three years after his death, and these were now expiring. Application was now made for a new patent, which was promised. But not unnaturally Rich, con-



ceiving this was a good opportunity to re-open the question of interference with his old patent, came to the Court of Chancery to oppose them. It was solemnly argued before the Lord Chancellor, the Chief Justice Raymond, and Mr. Baron Comyns. It was decided to be a lawful grant, and accordingly passed the Great Seal. This turned out fortunately for one of the partners, who, as we have seen,—in July—disposed of his share to Mr. Highmore, a fashionable amateur.

But there was more dangerous opposition still for the new enterprize. We have seen already how successful had been the "throwster" in his temporary theatre at the East End. This had drawn such crowds, that he was emboldened to establish a more ambitious undertaking. This prosperity was owing to his assistant, for he himself, as Chetwood says, not understanding the management, left it to Gifford, who did. He issued proposals for a subscription for thirty-two shares, the holders to receive 1s. 6d. each acting night, with a free admission, while as a security the ground was to be handed over to them as mortgagees. £2,300 was subscribed, on which, not without serious opposition from the city, ground was secured in Ayliffe Street, from Sir W. Lemon, on lease for sixty-one years, and at a rent of £45. Here a handsome though small theatre was speedily completed, and opened on October 2, 1732. The decorations, in the florid style, were the theme of great praise.

Meanwhile the new Covent Garden Theatre was being pushed on, and was now nearly completed. In scenery and decorations it was determined to excel all preceding efforts. Harvey and Lambert—who are mentioned as if their names were a sufficient guarantee of excellence—were busily engaged painting scenes, while Signor Amiconi, an artist in the florid La Guerre style, and who gained a reputation by painting the staircase of Lord Tankerville's house in St. James' Square, was painting the proscenium with a gorgeous apotheosis, in which Apollo and other divinities figured. The House "held" about £200. From the stage to the back of the boxes was about fifty-one feet, while the sitting accommodation only allowed twenty-one inches for each person, though two feet is the least space that offers comfort. This introduces us to another histrionic personage, who, like Franklin, had a dash of eccentricity.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Rich's Glory," or his Triumphant Entry into Covent Garden. This print alludes to the removal of Rich and his scenery, authors, actors, &c., from the play-house in Lincoln's-Inn-Fields to Covent Garden, and might therefore be as probably

We have already described the singular "mesnager" whose influence on the stage, or at least in the theatre, is felt to this day. It was John Rich, the first who gave distinct shape and interest to what is known as the pantomime. He was a pantomimist himself of the highest order, giving extraordinary vivacious and dramatic interpretation of the peculiar antics of harlequin, and had a special talent in devising harlequinades, which attracted the town and were singularly successful. He was moreover a manager, which in those days meant a good deal more than the director of a theatre, each office requiring its holder to be a "mesnager" of men and women, and to be fitted to carry on a struggle against hostile interests and do battle. He enjoyed the friendship of Hogarth, who painted at least two family "pieces" of the Rich's, one of which is in the Garrick Club. They are graceful pleasing groups in the Meissonier style.

By November all was spoken of as completely finished and ready for opening, but in September another of the three partners of Drury Lane was to depart, and on the 27th of that month Mr. Robert Wilks died at his house in Bow Street. He was buried on Wednesday, October 4th, in St. Paul's, Covent Garden. At his own request, he was interred at midnight, to avoid appearance of ostentation; but the gentlemen of the King's Chapel Choir attended and performed an anthem. This was a pleasant and graceful compliment.

referred to the year 1733, when that event happened. The scene is Covent Garden, across which, leading toward the door of the theatre, is a long procession, consisting of a cart, loaded with thunder and lightning, actors, &c., and at the head of which is Rich, invested with the skin of the famous dog in *Perieus and Andromeda*, riding with a lady in a chariot driven by harlequin, and drawn by satyrs, or yahoos. The verses at the bottom of this plate explain the artist's meaning:

Not with more glory through the streets of Rome,  
Return'd great conquerors in triumph home,  
Than, proudly drawn with beauty by his side,  
We see gay R—— in gilded chariot ride.  
He comes, attended by a num'rous throng,  
Who, with loud shouts, huzza the chief along.  
No sensible and pretty play will fall  
Condemn'd by him as not theatrical.  
The players follow, as they here are nam'd,  
Dress'd in each character for which they're fam'd.  
Quin th' old bach'lor, a hero Ryan shows,  
Who stares and stalks majestic as he goes.

\* "No sensible and pretty play," &c. "This," says Mr. Ireland, "refers to Cibber's decision on the merits of some piece offered for representation." In a copy of verses addressed to Rich on the building of Covent Garden Theatre, are the following lines, which seem to allude to the rejection already mentioned:

Poets no longer shall submit their plays  
To learned Cibber's gilded withered bays;  
To such a judge the labour'd scene present,  
Whom sensible and pretty won't content.

At last, on December 7, 1732, the new Theatre Royal, Covent Garden, was opened. It was announced rather significantly that it was "under the dormant patent granted by Charles the Second to Sir W. Davenant," and we find Aaron Hill, in a letter to Pope, repeating the statement. This became of importance later, when it was urged that one of the patents had merged or disappeared owing to non user.

The bill set out: "By the company of comedians will be revived, *The Way of the World*, the clothes, scenes, and decorations entirely new; but on account of the great demand for places, the pit and boxes, by desire, will be laid together at 5s., gallery 2s., upper gallery 1s. And to prevent the scenes being crowded, the stage half a guinea. All persons who want places are desired to send to the stage door (the passage from Bow Street leading to it), where attendance will be given and places kept for the following nights as usual."

"The parts were thus cast: Mirabel, Ryan; Fainall, Quin; Witwood, Chapman; Petulant, Neale; Sir Wilful, Hippiessley; Waitwell, Pinkethman; Lady Wishfort, Mrs. Eggleton; Milla-mant, Mrs. Younger; Marwood, Mrs. Hallam; Mrs. Fainall, Mrs. Buchanan; and Foible, Mrs. Steevens, who was later to become the manager's wife. Quin then was a judicious speaker of Fainall's sentiments, but heavy in action and deportment; Walker, who succeeded him, understood and expressed the assumed spirit and real insolence of this artful character much better; Ryan was greatly inferior to the accomplished Mirabel of Wilks; and Chapman's Witwood, though not so finished as that of Colley Cibber, was of his own drawing, and very comic. It was agreed that everything about the theatre was magnificently appointed. Such was the report of Tom Davies, who would appear to have "assisted" at the opening of Covent Garden, for he was much impressed by this worthy display, which was likely to bring aid to the cause of legitimate drama.

At this point, when a new and most important theatrical enterprize is starting, and one of the most successful periods of English management has come to a conclusion, may be fitly brought to a close this review of the very little known early stages of the English drama from the days of the Restoration. For the first time, a clear, detailed, consecutive account of a somewhat misty and antiquarian period has been presented to the reader, in which the personages and events

follow with regularity, and everything falls into the order of a coherent narrative. All that follows is familiar to most persons, and the next events of importance, viz., the rise and successful management of Garrick, followed by that of the gifted Kemble family, have been treated by myself and others in separate works. With the winding up of the present series of THE MONTH we may pause here, and conclude these "Chronicles of the Stage."

PERCY FITZGERALD.

follow with regularity and everything falls into the order of a coherent narrative. All that follows is familiar to most persons, and the next events of importance viz., the rise and successful management of Garrick, followed by that of the gifted Kemble family, have been treated by myself and others in separate works. With the winding up of the present series and conclude these

### *The Upanishads.*

#### PART THE SECOND.

WE have selected the *Khândogya-Upanishad* as a typical example of this class of writings. We shall now give some analysis of its contents, and we shall then have something to say with reference to the position which has been claimed for the *Upanishads* by some of their European admirers. But first we must ask the reader to be patient with us. We shall have to follow at least some considerable portion of this *Upanishad* step by step, chapter by chapter, and even incomplete as our analysis will be, it will be anything but light reading. It would have been very easy for us to present a number of carefully selected extracts from this or from some other *Upanishad*, chosen so as to give a very favourable impression of the whole, or the reverse. One can find in the *Upanishads* sublime descriptions of the first source of all things, and side by side with these the most puerile arguments and the most absurd episodes. To select exclusively either one or the other kind of these passages, or to present them in such a way as to give no idea of the context which forms their setting would be to convey a misleading idea of the *Upanishads* as a whole. We have already in these articles protested against the system of describing the sacred literature of the East by means of telling passages entirely separated from their context. Whether such a process is used to exalt or to depreciate the writings in question, it is equally fallacious and unscientific. The Sacred Books must be judged as a whole, each one being considered in its entirety. On the other hand, to supply a running commentary on a complete text would in most cases be so lengthy and wearisome as to defeat its own object. A middle course must therefore be adopted. Such an analysis of the work under examination must be given that at least for some considerable portion of it the extracts shall be linked together by some brief account of the text that lies between them, and they



must represent not only the highest portions of the work but the lowest also, and include passages from which an idea may be formed of its average style. We have been guided by these principles in preparing the following analysis of the *Khândogya-Upanishad*. In his general preface Professor Max Müller speaks of the disappointment that will be experienced by the readers of many recent works on the religions of the East, when they turn to the present series of translations, and find the Sacred Books so unlike what they have been led to expect. We shall endeavour in the present case, as in all others, to give such an account of the work before us, that if any of our readers turns from our pages to those we have reviewed, he will have no such surprises in store for him, but will recognize in the complete text the picture of it traced in our brief analysis and commentary. But this will sometimes entail dull reading and pages full of strange and unattractive words and thoughts. This is the necessary consequence of fidelity to our original. We are exploring a strange country, and we cannot present only sketches of bold crags, sky-piercing summits, and sheltered well-watered valleys; we must mingle with them dull pictures of dank fen, barren stony moor, and sandy waterless desert; and as we are not artists in search of the picturesque, but explorers anxious to get materials for a truthful map of the whole, it is not our fault if in our notes the marsh and moor are named oftener than the hill-tops and the upland valleys.

With so much of preface we take up the *Khândogya-Upanishad* as translated for us by Professor Max Müller. We shall, besides other sources of information, make use in our account of it, of his own useful notes, and of the catena of extracts from the great Hindu commentator Sankara, collected by Rājendralal Mitra in his edition of the *Khândogya* in the *Bibliotheca Indica*.

In the Vedic ritual of India one of the most popular sacrifices was that of the Soma, the chief feature in which was the pouring of libations of the intoxicating juice of the Soma plant, accompanied by hymns celebrating its wonderful powers, and personifying it or associating it with a presiding god, so that Soma became the Dionysus of early India, and the centre of a group of legends. The *Rig-Veda* contains a number of these hymns to Soma, later on they were formed into a separate collection with additions from various other sources. This was the *Sâma-Veda*, the liturgy of the Soma sacrifice. Those priests who sang the

hymns during the rites were known as the Udgâtri priests, or the *Khândogas*—i.e. hymn singers.<sup>1</sup> The title of the *Khândogya*-Upanishad therefore means simply the "higher doctrine of the *Khândogas*," or priests of Soma, and the work is full of allusions to the sacrifice, endeavouring to explain in a mystic sense its words and actions. The Soma sacrifice belongs to the older religion of India, and except among some few enthusiasts for Vedic rites has long since disappeared from the religious practice of the country, and this fact is in itself a testimony to the antiquity of the Upanishad.

It consists of eight parts (*prapâthakas*), and each of these is again divided into a number of sections or short chapters (*khandas*). The udgîtha, or chant, at the Soma sacrifice, like every recitation of the Vedic hymns, was begun by the priest pronouncing the syllable Om. The author of the Upanishad begins by taking this syllable, declaring its mystic meanings, and dwelling on its importance. Om is a word of doubtful origin. It appears to have been an expression of solemn affirmation or assent, thus reminding us of the Hebrew *Amen*, which continually recurs in all Christian ritual. But no such simple explanation would satisfy that phase of the Indian mind which appears in the Upanishads. The author of the *Khândogya* takes the syllable Om and finds in it meaning after meaning, some of them, as even his friendly translator admits, "extremely artificial and senseless." In order to suggest these meanings the word is resolved into the three letters A, U, M, and each letter is declared to have now this, now that significance. Sometimes there is a play upon words which to the profane would seem more like punning than argument, at other times the most far-fetched analogies are introduced into the train of thought. The outcome of all this is that the syllable Om is to be understood as bringing before the mind the one all-sustaining, all-pervading being Brahma, or Paramâtmaan, the supreme soul of all things, or rather, the underlying reality of the world. The Upanishad begins thus:

<sup>1</sup> Professor Monier Williams says of the Soma: "It is remarkable that this sacred plant has fallen into complete neglect in modern times. When I asked the Brâhmanas of Northern India to procure specimens of the true soma for me, I was generally told that in consequence of the present sinful condition of the world the holy plant had ceased to grow on terrestrial soil, and was only to be found in Heaven. . . . A creeper said to be the true soma was pointed out to me by Dr. Burnell in Southern India, and is still, I believe, used by those orthodox Brâhmanas of the Marâtha country, who attempt to maintain the old Vedic worship" (*Contemporary Review*, September 1878, pp. 247, 248).

Let a man meditate on the syllable Om, called the Udgitha, for the Udgitha is sung beginning with Om. The full account, however, of Om is this : The essence of all beings is the earth, the essence of the earth is water, the essence of water the plants, the essence of plants man, the essence of man speech, the essence of speech the Rig-Veda, the essence of the Rig-Veda the Sâma-Veda, the essence of the Sâma-Veda the Udgitha (which is Om).<sup>2</sup>

In the first line there is a play upon words ; akshara, used in the sense of a letter, syllable or word is the neuter of an adjective, the earlier and simpler meaning of which is "unalterable, imperishable." Thus a hint is thrown out that not the mere syllable Om, but the unchangeable, imperishable Brahma, the soul of all things, typified by it, is to be the subject of meditation. Professor Max Müller thus explains the succeeding lines :

Essence, *rasa*, is explained in different ways, as origin, support, end, cause and effect. *Rasa* means originally the sap of trees. That sap may be conceived either as the essence extracted from the tree, or as what gives vigour and life to a tree. In the former case it might be transferred to the conception of effect, in the latter to that of cause. In our sentence it has sometimes the one, sometimes the other meaning. Earth is the support of all beings, water pervades the earth, plants arise from water, man lives by plants, speech is the best part of man, the Rig-Veda the best part of speech, the Sâma-Veda the best extract from the Rig-Veda, the Udgitha, or the syllable Om the crown of the Sâma-Veda.<sup>3</sup>

*Rasa* is of course a difficult term to translate. Essence, with all its associations as the representative of *οὐσία*, is not a very fortunate substitute for it, but essence is the translation usually given, and it would not be easy to find another. With this caution as to the meaning of "essence," the general sense of the opening lines of our Upanishad is clear enough. Already we see in them a spirit that is satisfied with a half-fanciful conceit instead of a definition, and something of that vagueness in the use of terms which makes close argument impossible. The writer in the same way, half arguing, half playing upon words, proceeds to insist upon the importance of the Udgitha Om as the centre of the whole Soma sacrifice, and concludes the chapter by thus repelling rather than solving an obvious objection :

<sup>2</sup> *Khândogya-Upanishad*, I. I. 1, 2 ; *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. i. pp. 1, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Sacred Books*, vol. i. p. 1, note.

Now therefore it would seem to follow that both he who knows this (the true meaning of the syllable Om), and he who does not, performs the same sacrifice. But this is not so, for knowledge and ignorance are different. The sacrifice which a man performs with knowledge, faith, and the Upanishad is more powerful. This is the full account of the syllable Om.<sup>4</sup>

In the next chapter we have a tale which seems at first sight to be a bit of pure mythology. The Devas and Asuras (gods and demons) "both of the race of Pragapati" are at war. The Devas take the Udgitha Om to crush the Asuras, they contemplate it successively as scent, speech, sight, hearing, mind, but each time the Asuras taint it, thus contemplated, with evil, and so it comes that men in sense and mind dwell both on good and evil. At last the Devas meditate it as the breath of life and the Asuras are scattered "like a ball of earth that hits a solid stone." Sankara, in his comment on this passage, treats it as a parable. The Devas are here, he explains, man's faculties enlightened by knowledge, the Asuras are faculties devoted to self-enjoyment and unenlightened.

The Asuras, or the dark passions common to all animated creatures, being naturally disposed to overcome those faculties which have the light of the Sâstra for their guide, and again the Devas, or faculties enlightened by the Sâstra being opposed to the former, the wars of the Devas and Asuras—i.e. their mutual contentions for supremacy, are constant from eternity within the breast of every creature. This contest is here narrated by the Sruti (revealed doctrine) in the form of a tale in order to develop a knowledge of the cause of virtue and vice and of the purity of life.<sup>5</sup>

It would seem, then, that Sankara took the passage to mean that when men meditate their own vital breath or soul (prâna, lit. breath, here clearly identified with soul) as Om—that is, recognize in it the universal soul, in them the higher feelings and faculties will conquer the baser. But it may be questioned if this was the original meaning of the writer who long centuries before the days of Sankara's commentaries, told this tale of gods and demons. However this may be, the chapter concludes not with a promise of moral victory, such as Sankara speaks of, but with the assertion that if a man knows all this, the chant of the Udgitha will bring him all he wishes. Of course here again

<sup>4</sup> I. I. 10; *Sacred Books*, i. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Rājendralāl Mitra's *K'hândogya-Upanishad* (*Bibliotheca Indica*) p. 11. Sâstra here means such knowledge as is to be obtained from the sacred writings.

an inner meaning might be suggested, but as the words stand in their plain sense, the philosopher has sunk in the Brahman upholding the efficacy of the Soma sacrifice.

In the next chapter, after some further identifications of Om, the writer turns to the equivalent word Udgitha, he proposes its syllables as means of identifying it with anything and everything, that has some corresponding syllable in any word relating to it. Thus he begins :

Let a man meditate on the syllables of the Udgitha, *i.e.*, on the word Udgitha. Ut is breath (*prāṇa*) for by means of breath a man rises (*uttishṭhati*). Gi is speech, for speeches are called *giraḥ*. Tha is food, for by means of food all subsists (*sthita*). Ut is Heaven, *gi* the sky, *tha* the earth, &c. &c.<sup>6</sup>

And so he goes on heaping up the same kind of senseless comparisons : "All this is very childish," says Professor Max Müller in a note. "Very childish, and worse than childish, but it is interesting as a phase of folly which is not restricted to the Brahmans of India." And he proceeds to give a long extract from a nameless mediæval writer in which an equally absurd interpretation is given of the gamut Do, Re, Mi, &c. This is one of the longest notes in the book, and is clearly meant to remove the damaging impression produced on a reader of the text it illustrates. But even such a note cannot make us forget that the Upanishad is not an obscure treatise of an individual, but part of the *Sruti*, the revealed literature of Brahmanism, one of those works which, we have been assured, "stand unrivalled in the literature of India, nay, in the literature of the world."<sup>7</sup>

We need not dwell on the following sections, in one we are told how the Devas owe their immortality to their knowledge of Om ; in another he who knows the Udgitha is privileged to correct errors made in the sacrifice ; then come more identifications, this time the syllables of "Sāma" being the pretext for them, and there is a curious passage about a golden being that dwells in the sun, to which Sankara in his comments gives a mystic sense, but which may very well have been an outcome of sun-worship. In the eighth and ninth sections we have an interesting account of a conference between three learned men, two of them are Brahmans, the third is a learned Raganya or Kshatriya, and it is curious to note that

<sup>6</sup> I. 3. 6; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 8.

<sup>7</sup> *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, p. 318.



he it is that comes best out of the discussion. This is one of the marks of Kshatirya influence in the composition of the *Khândogya*. The three men sit down "to have a discussion on the Udgîtha." One of the Brahmans first questions the other, and is told that the Sâma-Veda has its origin in svara, voice, that this comes from breath, which is sustained by food, food is produced by water, and water comes from svarga, heaven. "And what is the origin of that world (heaven)?" asks the questioner Silaka, and Dalbhya the other Brahman answers: "Let no man carry the Sâman beyond the world of 'svarga,'" and Silaka tells him that if the loss of one's head were the penalty of ignorance, Dalbhya's head would surely fall. But Silaka himself when questioned cannot go beyond the heaven of svarga; and the third sage, the Kshatirya reproaches him with his ignorance, and on being challenged to tell more himself, replies to the question, whence comes the heaven of svarga (already acknowledge as the source of everything) that "ether" is its source and cause. The Sanskrit word is âkâsa, and ether with its manifold meanings translates it very aptly: âkâsa, originally clearness, light, is applied to universal space, to the blue depths of the sky, or to a subtle fluid filling all space, and supplying the principle of life and the vehicle of sound, then by an easy transition âkâsa means simply Brahma, and this is its meaning here. Thus Gaivali, the Kshatirya sage, develops his answer:

The origin of this world is ether. For all these beings take their rise from the ether and return into the ether. Ether is older than these, ether is their rest. He is indeed the Udgîtha (*i.e.* Om = Brahma) greater than the great, he is without end . . . He who thus knows the Udgîtha and meditates on it thus, his life in this world will be greater than the great, and also his state in the other world, yea in the other world.<sup>8</sup>

This is one of the flashes of light which relieve the tedium of the weary mass of senseless mysticism which forms so large a part of the Upanishad. It almost seems as if we had not here one connected work, but a collection of narratives, and detached pieces of exegesis, for immediately the three sages are forgotten, the lesson taught by Gaivali is developed no further, and we have a tale of a poor Brahman who though all but starving is able to convince a number of his fellow-Brahmans

<sup>8</sup> I. 9, 1, 2, 4; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 17. The repetition of the concluding words indicates the close of that part of the subject.

of the danger of offering sacrifice without possessing due knowledge. Then comes what may be perhaps a fable. It is sufficiently absurd :—

Now follows the Udgitha of the dogs. Vaka Dâlbhya, or as he was also called Glava Maitreya went out to repeat the Veda in a quiet place. A white dog appeared before him, and other dogs gathering round him, said to him : "Sir, sing and get us food, we are hungry." The white dog said to them : "Come to me to-morrow morning." Vaka Dâlbhya watched. The dogs came on holding together, each dog keeping the tail of the preceding dog in his month as the priests do when they are going to sing praises with the Vahishpavamâna hymn.<sup>9</sup> After they had settled down, they began to say Hin. "Om, let us eat ! Om, let us drink ! Om, may the divine Varuṇa, Praṇapati, Savitṛi bring us food ! Lord of food, bring hither food, bring it, Om !" <sup>10</sup>

The original idea of this fable, if fable it is, may simply have been that the dog can only pray or wish for food. Sankara is puzzled by it, and in his comment suggests that "the most reasonable explanation" is that some God, perhaps even the very source of life, pleased at Vaka's study of the Veda appeared to him as a dog. The comment is, if possible, more absurd than the text, and the further suggestion that in the last four lines Varuṇa and Praṇapati are epithets of Savitṛi the sun as the giver of rain and the protector of men, shows how far the Upanishads were from being inconsistent with polytheism and nature worship.

The first part of the Upanishad closes with a section which finds far-fetched meanings in the musical tones, Hân, Hâi, Hin, and the rest, used in the recitation of the Veda. The numerous sections of the second part are devoted to comparing in the same way the whole Sâma-Veda, to every part of the visible and invisible worlds and all they contain. Certain blessings are promised to such as know this or that form of the Sâma under each of these aspects, and each of the five parts of the chants at the sacrifice<sup>11</sup> is given a meaning in connection with the object to which the whole rite is compared. We may take as average examples the fourteenth and fifteenth sections, in which the

<sup>9</sup> Alluding to a ceremony in which the priests walked in procession, each one holding the robe of his predecessor.

<sup>10</sup> I. 12 ; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 20.

<sup>11</sup> The hinkâra, prastâva, udgîtha, prathîhâra, and nidhana, *i.e.*, the opening notes, the prelude or introductory chant, the chief chant, the verses that mark the beginning of the finale, and the concluding chant or finale itself.

chant of the Veda at the sacrifice is compared to the daily course of the sun and to a storm of thunder and rain :

XIV. 1. Rising the sun is the hinkâra, risen he is the prastâva, at noon he is the udgîtha, in the afternoon he is the pratihâra, setting he is the nidhana. That is the Brihat Sâmān as interwoven in the sun. 2. He who thus knows the Brihat as interwoven in the sun, becomes refulgent and strong, he reaches the full life, he lives long, becomes great with children and cattle, great by fame. His rule is "Never complain of the heat of the sun."

XV. 1. The mists gather, that is the hinkâra; the cloud has risen, that is the prastâva; it rains, that is the udgîtha; it flashes and thunders that is the pratihâra; it stops, that is the nidhana. That is the Vairûpa Sâmān, as interwoven in Parganya, the god of rain. 2. He who thus knows the Vairûpa, as interwoven in Parganya, obtains all kinds of cattle (virûpa), he reaches the full life, he lives long, becomes great with children and cattle, great by fame, "His rule is never complain of the rain."<sup>12</sup>

In this way the Sâmān is identified with all things in succession. Finally it is declared to be identical with everything, and we are told :

He who knows this, knows everything. All regions offer him gifts. His rule is, "Let him meditate (on the Sâmān) knowing that he is everything, yea, that he is everything."<sup>13</sup>

And so we have again a suggestion of the pantheistic identity of all things which the Vedantists hold to be the teaching of the whole of the Upanishad. The sections that follow declare that sacrifice, study of the Veda, charity, austerity, "obtain the worlds of the blessed, but the Brahmasamstha alone" (that is he who is firmly grounded in the doctrine of Brahma) "obtains immortality."<sup>14</sup> What this immortality is we shall see later on. The concluding section of this part (II. 24) is important as it declares the fitness of particular sacrifices to certain classes of deities, and lays down that it is right that the priest should know the inner meaning of his act, though Sankara insists that this does not exclude the priest who is ignorant of such higher knowledge. The passage is only one of the many

<sup>12</sup> II. 14 and 15; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 30. The twelfth section contains a comparison of the Sâmān with fire made with the fire sticks, and its concluding rule, "Do not rinse the mouth or spit before the fire," reminds one of the precautions taken by the Parsi priests who wear a veil over the mouth and nose lest their breath should contaminate the sacred fire. Cf. Haug. *Essays on the Parsis*, p. 243 note.

<sup>13</sup> II. 21, 4; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 33.

<sup>14</sup> II. 23, 2; *Ibid.* i. p. 35.

which recognize ritual and polytheism as existing side by side with the higher way of knowledge, and make it hard to understand Professor Max Müller's declaration that the writers of the Upanishads "*after destroying the altars of their old gods built out of the scattered bricks a new altar to the Unknown God—unknown, unnamed, and yet omnipresent.*"<sup>15</sup>

The third part opens by describing at length the sky as the beehive of the gods, full of the sunlight which is their honey, describes the different rays of the sun as the food of various classes of supernatural beings, the Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas, Maruts, and Sādhyas, and sets forth the advantages of knowing this. Then the writer, no longer speaking of the rising and setting sun, tells of a sunlight that once seen is never obscured, namely the knowledge of Brahma. "To him," he says, "who thus knows this Brahma-Upanishad the sun does not rise and does not set. For him there is day once and for all."<sup>16</sup> This is knowledge, it is added, more precious than all else, handed down from the first of men. After an argument as to how a certain form of verse represents Brahma, the writer, for whom this is no idle digression, speaks again in the same spirit:

The Brāhma which has been thus described is the same as the ether which is around us. And the ether which is around us is the same as the ether which is within us. And the ether which is within us, that is the ether within the heart. That ether in the heart is omnipresent and unchanging. He who knows this obtains omnipresent and unchangeable happiness.<sup>17</sup>

Let the reader not forget that ākāśa, the word here used for ether, means really space subtly filled by an invisible fluid, and that as it became a type of the omnipresent soul of all things, ākāśa, ether, came to mean simply, as it means here, the omnipresent Brahma, filling the heart of man and filling, too, all space. That it exists in the heart the Upanishad endeavours to show by a puerile argument, the chief interest of which is that it throws some light on the simple-minded character of the writer. The bodily heat is said to be one sign of Brahma's presence, and another is the fact that even when the ears are stopped, we hear in them a noise like the buzz of a great fire within us. Then in worthier language he proceeds:

All this (*i.e.* all that exists) is Brahma (neuter). Let a man meditate on that (the visible world) as beginning, ending, and breathing in it

<sup>15</sup> *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, p. 311.

<sup>16</sup> III. 11, 3; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 44.

<sup>17</sup> III. 12, 7-9; *Ibid.*, p. 46.

(Brahma). Now man is a creature of will. According to what his will is in this world, so will he be when he has departed this life. Let him therefore have this will and belief:—The intelligent whose body is spirit, whose form is light, whose thoughts are true, whose nature is like ether (omnipresent and invisible), from whom all works, all desires, all sweet odours and tastes proceed: he who embraces all this, who never speaks, and is never surprised; he who is myself within the heart, smaller than a corn of rice, smaller than a corn of barley, smaller than a mustard seed, smaller than a canary seed or the kernel of a canary seed; he also is myself within the heart, greater than the earth, greater than the sky, greater than heaven, greater than all these worlds. He from whom all works, all desires, all sweet odours, and tastes proceed, who embraces all this, who never speaks and is never surprised, he, myself within the heart, is that Brahma. When I shall have departed from hence I shall obtain him. He who has this faith has no doubt.<sup>18</sup>

Much of this the Christian might say of his God. It is one of those exalted passages which taken apart from their context give a false idea of the excellence of the Upanishads, and which unless read in the light of the known history of Indian thought would give an equally false idea of the standard of religious feeling prevalent in India in the later days of the Vedic age. So high a flight as this description of Brahma is not long sustained, throughout the Upanishad seems after such passages to sink at once to the lowest level. There is a flash of light and then double darkness. Thus the sections that immediately follow this passage are made up of what look very like spells for obtaining a son and a long life. The third part concludes with a section which refers to the old myth of the world being developed from an egg, and contains a passage that speaks of entity springing from non-entity,<sup>19</sup> a phrase that has sadly perplexed the commentators who usually take refuge in the theory that non-existent (*asat*) or unreal here only means formless and undeveloped. But these are matters we cannot enter into here: they will find a more fitting place in a discussion of the Hindu cosmogony.

Nor need we dwell upon the sections of the fourth part. They contain only accounts of how various sages reached the higher knowledge, and their style is wearisome, tedious, and without lengthy comment unintelligible. They are much

<sup>18</sup> III. 14; *Ibid.* p. 48.

<sup>19</sup> III. 19, 1; *Ibid.* p. 54. The passage is in direct contradiction to VI. 2, 1 and 2, which is given in our extract, *infra* p. 542.



of the same character as some of those earlier chapters which we have described at length.

The fifth part opens with a fable intended to show that the vital breath is the highest part of man. The senses, or rather the mind, vital breath and some of the senses, dispute which is greatest; to decide the question each departs in turn from man for a year. Speech goes, and man lives as a dumb person, sight, and though blind he still lives, mind goes, and he lives, "like children whose mind is not yet formed," but as the vital breath prepares to go he tears up "the other senses as a horse going to start might tear up the pegs to which he is tethered," and they cry out to him: "Be thou our lord. Thou art the best among us. Do not depart from us."<sup>20</sup> The story reminds one of Menenius Agrippa's less poetical fable told to the plebeians. Amongst the discussions related in the rest of this part is one on the transmigration of souls, in which we have an account of the return to earth of those, who have not by attaining the higher knowledge escaped the evil of another birth. According to a man's conduct in one existence his fate is determined in his next birth. Thus we are told:

Those whose conduct has been good will quickly attain some good birth, the birth of a Brahman or a Kshatriya or a Vaisya. But those whose conduct has been evil will quickly attain an evil birth, the birth of a dog, or a hog, or a *Kandāla*.<sup>21</sup>

The idea of successive births here enunciated is one that the Aryans seem to have acquired after their settlement in India. It is unknown in the Mantra portion of the Veda, but once it had obtained a hold upon the Indian mind in the period immediately following that in which the Vedic hymns were collected together, it became the germ of a vast system of theory and practice, and coloured every phrase of Hindu religion, philosophy and life. The terror of evil births in the future, the fear of new periods of wretched struggling with adverse fates, made the securing of a permanent departure from the world the highest object of aspiration and endeavour. Immortality for the Hindu came to mean that he would not have to die again, when, freed from personality, he could not be forced back by a second birth into the region of death. He alone had really secured immortality who had attained to the recognition of his

<sup>20</sup> V. 1. 6—15; *Sacred Books*, i. pp. 72—74.

<sup>21</sup> V. 10. 7; *Ibid.* p. 82. A *Kandāla* is a man of the lowest of the mixed castes.

identity with the source and underlying soul of all, and escaping alike from merit and demerit, became for ever merged in the one existence from which he had originally been separated. So later on the tone of the Hindu mind was lowered, till men were ready to proclaim as a gospel of deliverance, that all existence was evil and extinction the highest good.

But we must return to the *Khândogya*. The fifth part concludes with some chapters relating discussions on the inner meaning and efficacy of various sacrificial rites. The sixth part is perhaps the most striking and interesting in the whole. It is entirely taken up with a discussion in which the Brahman Uddālaka instructs his young son Svetaketu. He puts before him the identity of all things, illustrating the doctrine by various parallels, as for instance by the fact that all pottery, though speech gives it different names, is after all but clay. Then in answer to Svetaketu's questions as to how all this can be, he tells him :

In the beginning, my dear, there was that only which is<sup>22</sup> (ॐ ई) one only without a second. Others say, in the beginning there was only that which is not (ॐ अ ई) one only, without a second, and from that which is not that which is was born. But how could it be thus, my dear [the father continued]. How could that which is be born of that which is not? No, my dear, only that which is, was in the beginning, one only without a second.<sup>23</sup>

The phrase here used—*ekam evadvityam*—"one only without a second," has become the watchword of the Vedānta, the pantheistic philosophy of India. The following is a portion of the comment of the great Vedāntist teacher, Sankara, on this passage :—

*Sat* (= Gk. ॐ ई, Eng. "being,") is that substance which is mere being or existence: it is invisible, indistinct, all pervading, one only, without defect, without members, knowledge itself, and that which is indicated by all the Vedāntas. The word *eva* (merely, only) is used to make the declaration more positive. But what does it make positive? We say in reply that this world, which we see with its name and form, full of actions and mutations, was [at one time in a state of] mere being. When one observes in the morning a potter intent on making wares with his clay, and having passed the day in another village, on one's return in the evening sees a variety of pots, pans, and other wares, one says, "These pots and pans were in the morning mere clay;" so it

<sup>22</sup> That is, mere being, as being; not being in many forms as it now exists.

<sup>23</sup> VI. 2, 1-2; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 93.

is said [of the world], "This was in a state of mere being before." . . . "Without a second:" in the case of a pitcher or other earthen vessel there is beside the clay the potter, &c., who give it shape, but in the case of the being in question the epithet, without a second, precludes all coadjutors or co-efficients.<sup>24</sup>

To return to the Brahman's lesson to his son,—Uddāhala goes on to describe how this primary being (*sat*, neuter= $\tau\omicron\delta\ \delta\nu$ ) evolved the world from itself. "It thought," he says, "may I be many, may I grow forth. It sent forth fire." In the same way it gave forth water and earth, and then he tells his son how from these three elements all things are formed, and even man himself. The examples and illustrations he gives are of course in complete disagreement with all Western ideas of science or philosophy. He tells his son that "mind comes from food,<sup>25</sup> breath from water, speech from fire,"<sup>26</sup> and Svetaketu having understood thus that all things are formed of three elements evolved from primal being, the second part of the lesson begins.

Uddālaka puts sleep before his son as an image of death. In deep, dreamless sleep, he says, the soul has gone to unite itself for awhile to *sat*, Being or the True;<sup>27</sup> the man is gone to what is identical with his own self.<sup>28</sup> Then after an argument to show how all the elements of man come from this *sat* or primal being (=Brahma, neuter), he further develops the idea of this return to union with the first cause of all:—

IX. As the bees, my son, make honey, by collecting the juices of distant trees, and reduce the juices into one form. And as these juices have no discrimination, so that they might say (*i.e.*, so as to be able to say), I am the juice of this tree or that, in the same manner, my son, all these creatures when they have become merged in the True (either in deep sleep or in death) know not that they are merged in the True.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup> Rājendralāl Mitra's *Āhāndogya-Upanishad*, pp. 101, 102. "Vedāntas," in the fourth line of the extract is equivalent to "Upanishads." The parallel of the potter so often used in both text and commentary recalls St. Paul's use of the same illustration (Rom. ix).

<sup>25</sup> Of which one of the alleged proofs is that a man who has fasted fifteen days cannot remember anything.

<sup>26</sup> VI. 7, 6; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 98.

<sup>27</sup> From *sat*, being, is derived *satyam*, the True, that which truly exists apart from all delusion. Used in this sense, *satyam* is, as in the following passages, identical with *sat*, or Brahma.

<sup>28</sup> The explanation ends with the following play upon words: "Therefore they say 'svapiti,' he sleeps, because he is gone (*apita*) to his own (*sva*)" (VI. 8, 1; *Sacred Books*, p. 99).

<sup>29</sup> VI. 9, 1-2; *Ibid.* p. 101.

And then he adds :

Now that which is that subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the True. It is the Self, *and thou, O Svetaketu, art it.*<sup>30</sup>

The phrase, *tat tvam asi*, "thou art it," occurs again and again throughout the sixth part. It is one of the mahāvākyas, the "great words," that sum up in one brief formula a wide range of doctrine. It expresses the identity of Svetaketu's self or soul with the inner Self of all things, Brahma or Sat, the one reality. This teaching is illustrated and developed by a long series of comparisons and illustrations. Thus by comparing the souls of men and of all creatures to rivers merged in the sea, and no longer able to say, "I am this or that river," he illustrates how creatures in the sea of this world have forgotten their source, and are not conscious of their identity with the first Being. We give here sections XI.—XIII. as an example of the whole. In the first of these three sections Uddālaka shows how life merged by death in the Sat is not really destroyed, in the second how the world springs from the Sat as a mighty tree from its seed, and in the third how the Sat though pervading all things is invisible, as salt pervading water is imperceptible to sight and touch :

XI. 1. "If some one were to strike at the root of this large tree here, it would bleed but live. If he were to strike at its stem it would bleed but live. If he were to strike at its top it would bleed but live. Pervaded by the living Self, that tree stands firm, drinking in its nourishment and rejoicing.

2. But if the life (the living Self) leaves one of its branches, that branch withers ; if it leaves a second, that branch withers ; if it leaves a third, that branch withers. If it leaves the whole tree, the whole tree withers. In exactly the same manner, my son, know this."

Thus he spoke :

3. "This (body) indeed withers and dies when the living Self has left it : the living Self dies not. That which is that subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the True. It is the Self, and thou, O Svetaketu, art it."

"Please, sir, inform me still more," said the son.

"Be it so, my child," the father replied.

XII. 1. "Fetch me from thence a fruit of the Nyagrodha tree." "Here is one, sir." "Break it." "It is broken, sir." "What do you see there?" "These seeds, almost infinitesimal." "Break one of them." "It is broken, sir." "What do you see there." "Not anything, sir."

<sup>30</sup> VI. 9, 4; *Ibid.*

2. The father said, "My son, that subtle essence which you do not perceive there, of that very essence this great Nyagrodha tree exists."

3. "Believe it, my son. That which is the subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the True. It is the Self, and thou, O Svetaketu, art it."

"Please, sir, inform me still more," said the son.

"Be it so, my child," the father replied.

XIII. 1. "Place this salt in water, and then wait on me in the morning." The son did as he was commanded. The father said to him, "Bring me the salt, which you placed in the water last night." The son having looked for it found it not, for, of course, it was melted.

2. The father said, "Taste it from the surface of the water. How is it?" The son replied, "It is salt." "Taste it from the middle. How is it?" The son replied, "It is salt." "Taste it from the bottom. How is it?" The son replied, "It is salt." The father said, "Throw it away, and then wait on me." He did so, but salt exists for ever. Then the father said, "Here also in this body, forsooth, you do not perceive the True (Sat), my son: but there indeed it is."

3. "That which is the subtle essence, in it all that exists has its self. It is the True. It is the Self, and thou, O Svetaketu, art it."

"Please, sir, inform me still more," said the son.

"Be it so, my child," the father replied.<sup>31</sup>

So the conference goes on, proceeding from point to point with a perseverance and order which does not appear in the earlier part of the Upanishad. Nowhere else in the whole work is the thread of the discussion held so long. It concludes with a somewhat obscure illustration drawn from the ordeal of fire, the meaning of which is, according to the commentator, that as the man who is covered with falsehood is burned by the heated hatchet which he grasps, while he who is innocent is unhurt, so the man who does not know the True Self is repelled from it even when he approaches it by death and is driven back into new births, and "has to suffer till he acquires some day the true knowledge,"<sup>32</sup> while he who possesses this knowledge is merged in the Self, and safe from the evils that beset all separate existence.

The seventh part is like the sixth, complete in itself, being an account of a long discussion in which the sage Sanatkumāra teaches his disciple Nārada how all knowledge is useless without the knowledge of the inward Self of the universe. In the first section Nārada gives a boastful catalogue of the sciences he has already studied. Merely to read the list is enough to convince

<sup>31</sup> VI. 11—13; *Ibid.* pp. 102—105.

<sup>32</sup> *Sacred Books*, i. p. 108, note.



one that some centuries must have elapsed between the period of this Upanishad and that in which the literature of the Aryans of India consisted only of the hymns of the Rig-Veda. Nārada concludes by confessing his ignorance of the one important point :

"But, sir, with all this, I know the Mantras (hymns) only, the sacred books. I do not know the Self. I have heard from men like you, that he who knows the Self overcomes grief. I am in grief. Do, sir, help me over this grief of mine."<sup>33</sup>

Sanatkumāra begins his teaching by saying that all this knowledge is but a name. Then in successive sections he tells how speech, by which we obtain understanding is better than a name, mind is better than speech, will than mind, consideration than will, concentrated reflection than consideration, understanding than reflection, power than understanding, food than power (because a ten days' fast will make any man helpless), water than food, fire than water, ether than fire, memory than ether, hope than memory, and *prāṇa* (spirit, self, or life) better than hope, so as at once to surpass and embrace all that goes before.<sup>34</sup> The argument on each point is drawn out at some length, but no true sequence links the parts together. The series here presented to us has no real connection or gradation; the whole line of thought is like that of one who loses and takes up the thread of his discourse so illogically as to show that he half forgets it as he proceeds. But later on we see the teacher (in section XXVI.) enumerating the same series in a reversed order, and evidently regarding it as a necessary part of the argument by which he teaches Nārada how all things are but phases of the one existence. He further tells him that happiness is to be found only in the Infinite (*bhūman*, the highest, greatest, acme of all things); but the Infinite is explained to be the one existence known so as to exclude all else.

<sup>33</sup> VII. 1, 3; *Ibid.* p. 110.

<sup>34</sup> Professor Monier Williams (*Indian Wisdom*, p. 40) thus summarises the *Khândogya-Upanishad*, vii. 1—15. (The summary is printed like an extract) :— "The knowledge of these works is a mere name. Speech is greater than the name, Mind than Speech, Will than Mind, Sensation (or the capacity of feeling) is greater than Mind, Reflection is higher than Sensation, Knowledge than Reflection, Power than Knowledge, and highest of all stands *Prāṇa* or Life. As the spokes of a wheel are attached to the nave, so are all things attached to life." It will be noticed that six elements of the series (food, water, fire, ether, memory, hope) are omitted. The passage is thus much less extravagant than in the original.

XXIV. 1. "Where one sees nothing else, hears nothing else, understands nothing else, that is the Infinite. Where one sees something else, hears something else, understands something else, that is the finite. The Infinite is immortal, the finite is mortal."

"Sir, in what does the Infinite rest?"

"In its own greatness—or not even in greatness."

2. "In the world they call cows and horses, elephants and gold, slaves, wives, fields, and horses greatness. I do not mean this," thus he spoke, "for in that case one being (*i.e.*, the possessor) rests in something else."<sup>35</sup>

The discourse concludes with a promise of freedom from every tie that binds man to anything but the Self, a freedom which this knowledge is to produce.

The eighth part sets forth the same doctrines, the only difference is in the form of presenting them. In the earlier portion of it great stress is laid on the dwelling of Brahma in the heart, and the latter portion is a narrative in which Indra, the chief of the gods, and Virokama, the chief of the demons, are represented as coming to Pragapati (the "lord of creatures") to learn from him the higher knowledge. This was one of the passages from the Upanishads read by Professor Max Müller in the last of his Hibbert Lectures.<sup>36</sup>

We have gone so very fully into other portions of the Upanishad that we need not analyse the whole of this discussion, but there are some points in it which we must notice. At first by taking Pragapati's teaching in its literal sense both pupils are led to believe that the self is the body, Virokama the demon remains satisfied with this idea and teaches the demons that the body is alone to be cared for, and the Upanishad adds:

Therefore they call even now a man who does not give alms here, who has no faith, and offers no sacrifices, an Asura, for this is the doctrine of the Asuras (demons).<sup>37</sup>

But Indra is not satisfied. He comes back to ask further questions. He learns that the self is something in the body, but independent of it, not lame if it is lame, or blind if it is blind. But Indra objects that even so, though it does not suffer as the body does, a man's self is affected by the body's sufferings, and Pragapati begins to show him that freedom from the body, in deep sleep or death, uniting the individual self to the universal self, Brahma, is the refuge from these ills. He tells him:

<sup>35</sup> VII. 24, 1-2; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 123.

<sup>36</sup> *Hibbert Lectures*, 1878, pp. 318-327. "Pragapati and Indra."

<sup>37</sup> VIII. 8, 5; *Sacred Books*, p. 137.

When a man being asleep, reposing, and at perfect rest, sees no dreams, that is the Self, this is the immortal, the fearless, this is Brahma.<sup>38</sup>

Indra is at first satisfied, but then there springs up in him a doubt which must often have troubled the Hindu mind, and to which Pragapati gives no very sufficient answer :

He (Indra) said : " Sir, in that way he does not know himself (his self), that he is I, nor does he know anything that exists. He is gone to utter annihilation. I see no good in this." <sup>39</sup>

Pragapati's answer enforces the doctrine that inasmuch as individual personality is a delusion, the enlightenment that destroys it is no loss, but a gain. That each one is himself, if he but knew it, a portion of the universal soul or self of all things, and that that self is happy. Thus speaks Pragapati :

Maghavat,<sup>40</sup> this body is mortal and always held by death. It is the abode of that Self which is immortal and without body. When in the body (by thinking this body is I and I am this body), the self is held by pleasure and pain. But when he is free of the body (when he knows himself different from the body), then neither pleasure nor pain touches him.<sup>41</sup>

That is, says the commentator, no ordinary worldly pleasure ; for the self is declared in this very chapter of the Upanishad to be living in pleasure, and though worldly pleasures are named, the commentary explains away the expressions as being used in a figurative sense.

The concluding sections form a kind of hymn of exultation at the prospect of deliverance by knowing Brahma. " I come," exclaims the writer, " shaking off all evil as a horse shakes off his hairs, and as the moon frees herself from the month of Rāhu." <sup>42</sup> He knows the Self, the reality of all things, he is glorious among Brahmans, princes and men. He exults as if he were already free from the body, and he ends with a prayer in which, using words that express his horror at such a thought, he begs that once freed from life he may never return to the womb for a second birth.

Then in a different tone the Upanishad is brought to a close by the following short chapter :

Brahmā (masc.) told this to Pragapati, Pragapati to Manu, Manu to mankind. He who has learned the Veda from a family of teachers

<sup>38</sup> VIII. 11, 1 ; *Ibid.* p. 140.

<sup>39</sup> VIII. 11, 2 ; *Ibid.* <sup>40</sup> Maghavat, a name of Indra, " rich, abounding in gifts."

<sup>41</sup> VIII. 12, 1 ; *Sacred Books*, i. p. 140, 141.

<sup>42</sup> VIII. 13, 1 ; *Ibid.* p. 143. Rāhu, a monster supposed to swallow the moon or sun at each eclipse.

according to the sacred rule, in the leisure time left from the duties to be performed for the Guru (teacher), and who after receiving his discharge, has settled in his own house, keeping up the memory of what he has learned by repeating it regularly in some sacred spot, who has begotten virtuous sons and concentrated all his senses on the self, never giving pain to any creature except at the tirthas (sacrifices, &c.), he who behaves thus all his life, reaches the world of Brahma, and does not return, *yea, he does not return.*<sup>43</sup>

So ends the strange tangled skein of thought which we have tried to partially unravel. It suggests many reflections, but we shall defer them till we speak in another article of the Upanishads in general. We may however remark here that the *Khândogya-Upanishad* is clearly not a united whole. Its parts are as loosely connected as they are unequal in treatment and varied in their subject. It contains no complete system of philosophy, it gives us rather, as has well been said, detached "guesses at truth." It derives a certain unity from the fact that all these guesses tacitly assume that the world we see around us is delusion, inasmuch as they assert the existence of but one reality, Brahma, or *Âtman*, the soul and self of all, absolute being (*sat*), life (*prâna*), omnipresent like the ether (*âkâsa*), from which it is named. The Pantheism of later Indian schools is already far advanced in its development in the *Khândogya-Upanishad*. And it is strange to hear its thoughts expressed in other words by the thinkers of our own day. We have seen how *Pragapati* tells *Indra* that it is only his sense of his own personality that keeps him from the Self, and widely different as the form of expression is we have the same thought in some verses of the most popular of living poets:

The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains  
Are not these, O soul, the vision of Him Who reigns?

Is not the vision He? though He be not that which He seems.

Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?

Earth, those solid stars, this weight of body and limb,

Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him?

Dark is the world to thee, thyself art the reason why:

For is He not all but thou, that hast power to feel "I am I?"

But as we read these words, the doubt expressed full twenty-five centuries ago, makes answer to their implied doctrine of approach to the Highest Good by the loss of our own personality: "In truth he thus does not know himself that *he is I*, nor does he know that anything exists. He is gone to utter annihilation. I see no good in this."<sup>44</sup>

<sup>43</sup> VIII. 15; *Ibid.* p. 144.

<sup>44</sup> *Khândogya-Upanishad*, VIII. 11, 1.

### Dr. Pusey on Hell.<sup>1</sup>

WHEN the author of the *Analogy* laid it down, that "reason is the only faculty we have wherewith to judge of anything, even of revelation itself," he uttered a sentence which may be taken either in a true or in a false meaning. The statement is true, if it signify that the motives for receiving a revelation, as a revelation, are amenable to the tribunal of reason. It is also true, if it signify, that what manifestly contradicts reason cannot be a revealed dogma. But it is ruinously false, if it teach that reason can settle what is antecedently credible in the matter of revelation, and what not. The Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Real Presence could hardly stand that test. Even after a revelation has been given, reason is often unable to determine its exact import. This is true of mysteries, as needs no saying. But it holds also of matters more open to human calculation. On several such questions the candid mind, sternly disciplined not to judge beyond its powers of clear perception, will acknowledge its incompetence.

Now any one who has a fraction of that intellectual modesty which becomes human ignorance, ought to allow, that the evidence to pure reason, against eternal punishment, is very far from justifying an *à priori* condemnation of this doctrine as part of the revealed system. When it is borne in mind who God is, who man is, and, consequently, what sin is; when it is remembered that Hell is only for such as have knowingly, deliberately, and in grave matter rebelled against the Supreme Being, and persevered in that rebellion up to the end of life, generally with the neglect of many easy opportunities of pardon; it is a very bold thing indeed to say, that no amount of plain speaking in Scripture is plain enough to be taken literally in the sense of a denunciation of everlasting woe to sinners finally impenitent.

And here it must be noted that the controversy, as we are carrying it on, is wholly domestic. It is with Christians. With

<sup>1</sup> *What is of Faith respecting Eternal Punishment.* By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. James Parker and Co., 1880.



unbelievers, as a rule, we should simply refuse to discuss the point; because they deny those earlier principles, the previous admission of which is needful for entering upon a right estimation of our attitude in the present question. But against Christians, who allow our principles, we may confidently hope to make good our position in regard to the doctrine of eternal punishment. No Christian for a moment can pretend, that God's government of His creatures is the scheme of indiscriminate benevolence, which some vainly suppose, and on which the rejection of eternal damnation is chiefly based. Hard facts, and many of them, are against such a view. By outsiders they are made objections to Christianity as a whole. Furthermore, Scripture insists strongly and often on the awful terror of God's judgments. True, He is a God of mercy as well as of justice; but the former attribute coexists with the latter, and does not destroy it, nor make its exercise impossible. Hence the truth stands fast, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," that we must "work out salvation with fear and trembling," and that "it is a terrible thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

Yet it is only the statement of a patent fact to say, that preconceived notions as to what is exacted of the Divine clemency, not the obvious sense of Scripture itself, are now-a-days leading many so-called Christians to reject, from out their creed, what has been too substantially a part of it ever to be cast forth as peccant matter is expelled from the system in the process of healthy development. For, consider what is of the essence of our religion. Ours is an *indefectible* faith. Christ guaranteed it against error. Now, if there could be a glaring instance of failure in that promise, it would be in the proved falsity of the doctrine of everlasting punishment. Later on we shall have to say something on the indisputable Catholicity of the dogma. Here it is enough to take the admission of an adversary: "By far the greater number of those who accept the Bible as a revelation from God have understood it as teaching that the lost are lost for ever, and will suffer everlasting punishment. . . . That the punishment is to be endless has been the view of the majority of those who take Scripture as their guide—a view which they receive on the authority of our Lord's express words."<sup>2</sup> And again: "There are many texts which, at first

<sup>2</sup> A. Jukes, *Contemporary Review*, July, 1876; Professor J. B. Mayor, *Ibid.* May, 1875. In the same *Review*, April, 1878, the Rev. G. Salmon joins the general voice in the admission: "The history of the [Christian] religion proves summarily that, if

sight, do undoubtedly appear to assert the doctrine of endless punishment. It is only of late years that people in general have come to see, mainly owing to the writings of the late Professor Maurice, that the language of Scripture is not uniform, and that there is another side to the doctrine of punishment made known to us by revelation." Taking it, therefore, for granted, at present, that the eternity of punishment has for ages got itself commonly admitted in the Church, not merely as a theological opinion—for that may err—but as an article of faith; then, on Catholic principles, we must deem it preposterous to suppose, that a change of doctrine in such a case can ever become lawfully possible, even though we be told that a change *is* being wrought, "mainly owing to the writings of the late Professor Maurice." Why, a hundred professors cannot reverse the irreversible, reform the irreformable. Of course this language will not prove acceptable to those who hold, with the Anglican homily, that, for eight hundred years, the whole Church of God went lamentably astray. If any man, calling himself Christian, can yet believe the homily, he may also believe that, in the single point concerning the lot of those who die in grievous sin, the universal Church has erred from the truth. But the difficulty then arises, how one who believes that God could promise so solemnly and break His word so flagrantly, has any right to reject the idea of eternal torments, chiefly on the plea of God's goodness to men. If God will not give us the favours which He has pledged Himself to give, how shall we feel assured that he will show a mercy which He has nowhere undertaken to show, but which rather He has declared that He will not show?

Dr. Pusey's book is a reply to Canon Farrar's *Eternal Hope*. He refuses rightly to mix up the question of the eternity of loss with that of the number of the lost. The latter topic is dragged in only *ad invidiam*, and made to depend for its settlement on wholesale statements, that have no clear authority at their back. Leaving out, therefore, the discussion as to how the damned stand numerically in relation to the saved, we may follow Dr. Pusey in a division of the matter under three headings—namely (1) the Scripture evidence as borne out by

Christ revealed any doctrine of universal restitution, He did it so indistinctly that His followers failed to apprehend it. From the earliest times the popular and prevalent view among them was that which may be described as the popular and prevalent view among Christians still. The doctrine of universal restitution, if ever taught at all among Christians, was but the private idea of speculative men, struggling for a bare toleration, and ultimately struggling in vain."

Jewish tradition ; (2) the evidence from the Church's condemnation of Origenism ; and (3) the evidence from the Fathers.

I. It does not enter into Dr. Pusey's scope to deal at length with the positive side of the Scriptural argument. He rather stands on the defensive, than assumes the offensive. Hence it will be needful for us to supplement his work.

It is allowed by adversaries that the texts explicitly declaring the eternity of punishment would have to be taken just as they stand, were it not that their force is mitigated by other texts, which show forth that Christ's redemption is universal ; that as in Adam all were undone, so in our Saviour all are restored ; that God's wrath will not abide for ever, but that at length He will remember mercy ; that there is to be a restitution of all things, and that, in the end, God is to be "all in all." We deny that these passages warrant the conclusion which is drawn from them. They are in general terms, and, therefore, admit the check of *exceptis excipiendis*. They do not state *in particular* that souls dying in sin shall be reinstated after future purgation ; whereas the texts, on which we rely, do *in particular* state the contrary. The particular may limit the general, but not the general the particular. True, the law laid down in Scripture is not given in the phraseology of our legal documents, which are specially contrived to leave no loop-hole of escape for quibblers. The deed does not run : "If any person or persons, here or hereafter, or at any previous time, do die, shall die, or have died, in the state of grievous sin ; the lot of the said person or persons is fixed for ever ; in such sort that never shall it be altered, all general declarations notwithstanding, which may appear to make for the contrary." Not so does Holy Writ run. It leaves us, or, when we are perplexed, our authoritative interpreter, to give the exactness of formality to what it says in a manner less formal ; to point out that, while Christ's redemption is universally *applicable*, it is not, through man's fault, universally *applied* ;<sup>3</sup> that Christ's *doing* was universal as Adam's *undoing*, so far as Christ's share in the work went, but no further ; that the wrath of God, which is not to abide for ever, must be averted while yet there is time ; that the final

<sup>3</sup> If from the text, "God *willed* all to be saved," it is concluded that all *are* saved, how does it not follow from the text, "God *willed* all to come to the knowledge of the faith," that all *are* possessed of that knowledge ? The will in both cases must be conditional, not absolute. It may be well to add, that the fate of infants dying without baptism is throughout omitted from consideration, as no one can prove that their lot presents serious difficulty.

ordering of all things, in subjection to God, is compatible with a certain number of creatures being self-excluded from bliss, but nevertheless paying homage to God's sovereignty after the manner of their own foolish, free choice. Thus, without violence, and consonantly to the great Christian tradition, Scripture has its several utterances reconciled one with another. The conciliation is correct beyond all doubt. The matter admits of no more serious misgiving than do the questions of the Trinity, the equality of the Son with the Father, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Against each of these dogmas Scripture texts may be urged with the same degree of plausibility as against eternal punishment. But in all cases the real teaching of Holy Writ is manifestly on one side and not on the other.

The simplest way of treating the Scripture texts, which prove the eternity of punishment, will be to give them in their order of occurrence, almost without comment. However, for convenience' sake, they may be put under two headings. In the first division are such passages as more directly assert, that those who die in sin shall be under sentence of condemnation for ever. In the second category are the passages showing, or tending to show, that with death the time of trial is over, the issue being finally decided by life on this earth. Under the first class come the following citations :

Psalm xci. 8, 9, 10 : "The wicked shall spring up as grass, and all the workers of iniquity shall appear; that they may perish for ever and ever. But Thou, O Lord, art most high for evermore. For behold Thy enemies, O Lord, for behold Thy enemies shall perish, and all the workers of iniquity shall be scattered."<sup>4</sup>

Isaias xxxiii. 14 : "The sinners in Sion are afraid, trembling hath seized upon the hypocrites. Which of you can dwell with devouring fire? Which of you shall dwell with everlasting burnings?" (Compare the eternal lot of the just, Isaias xxxv. 10; xlv. 17; li. 11; lx. 19).

<sup>4</sup> This text may have a partial explanation, but only partial, in the worldly overthrow of God's enemies. But the words are exaggerative if restricted to this meaning. By a principle of very wide application indeed, the commentators on Scripture seek a spiritual meaning in those declarations, which, having an historic fulfilment, yet cannot rest there, but must go on to something beyond. Thus it is absurd to make what Isaias says of the glorious liberation from captivity stop short at the mere earthly event of the Jews leaving Babylon for Jerusalem. The spiritual sense of Scripture is as real and as clear an element as the historic, and often far more important. This remark applies to other texts quoted in the present connexion, e.g. Isaias xxvi. 24.

Isaias lxvi. 24: "And they shall go out and see the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against Me; their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched; and they shall be a loathsome sight to all flesh." (That these words apply also to the lost souls, appears from their triple repetition by our Lord—St. Mark ix.).

Daniel xii. 2: "Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some unto life everlasting, and others unto reproach, to see it always." (There is a variant reading of the last words, but of no importance).

St. Matt. iii. 12: "Whose fan is in His hand, and He will thoroughly cleanse His floor, and gather His wheat into the barn, but the chaff He will burn with unquenchable fire."

St. Matt. xii. 32: "Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him; but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come."

St. Matt. xviii. 8: "It is better for thee to go into life maimed or lame, than, having two hands or feet, to be cast into everlasting fire." (Cf. 9).

St. Matt. xxv. 41, 46: "Depart from Me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels. . . . And these shall go into everlasting punishment, but the just into life everlasting."

St. Matt. xvi. 24: "Woe to that man by whom the Son of Man is betrayed; it were better for him if that man had not been born."

St. Mark iii. 29: "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost shall never have forgiveness, but shall be guilty of an everlasting sin."

St. Mark ix. 42: "It is better for thee to enter into life maimed than, having two hands, to go into Hell, into unquenchable fire; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not extinguished." (Thrice repeated).

St. Luke iii. 17: "The chaff He will burn with unquenchable fire."

St. John iii. 36: "He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him."

1 Cor. vi. 9: "Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the Kingdom of God? Do not err; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, &c., shall possess the Kingdom of God."



(The sins enumerated are all such as can be committed in this life alone; not in a supposed state of probation after death. Cf. Apoc. xxi. 8. Yet they make the entrance in Heaven impossible).

2 Thess. i. 8, 9: "In a flame of fire yielding vengeance to those who know not God, and who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Who shall suffer eternal punishment in destruction, from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His power."

St. Jude, 6, 13: "The angels who kept not their principality, but forsook their own habitation, He hath reserved under darkness in everlasting chains, unto the judgment of the great day.<sup>5</sup> . . . To whom [the wicked] the storm of darkness is reserved for ever."

Apoc. xiv. 11: "The smoke of their torments shall ascend up for ever and ever." (For the force of the words, "for ever and ever," see Apoc. i. 6, 18; v. 13; vii. 12; x. 6).

Apoc. xx. 9—15: "There came down fire from God out of Heaven and devoured them; and the devil, who seduced them, was cast into the pool of fire and brimstone, where both the beast and the false prophet shall be tormented both day and night, for ever and ever. . . . They were judged every one according to their works. And Hell and death were cast into the pool of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the Book of Life, was cast into the pool of fire."

Apoc. xxi. 8: "The fearful, the unbelieving, the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their portion in the pool of fire and brimstone, which is the second death."

In the above texts it will be seen, that the pains of Hell are, in the first place, simply called *eternal*. So we read in Isaiah, Daniel, St. Matthew, the second Epistle to the Thessalonians, and the Epistle of St. Jude. It is useless to object that the Hebrew *olam*, like the Greek *αἰώνιος*, is sometimes used with a less extensive signification. Into what is called the scholarship of these points there is no need to enter. For what every plain man may know, and what no scholar can get beyond, is that, of

<sup>5</sup> This does not mean that, after the Day of Judgment, the evil spirits will be released. Such a view is contradicted (Apoc. xx. 9—15). Besides, in Holy Scripture, *donec* (until) is often used to specify a period, without making that period the finishing term of the state described.

course, such words are liable to employment occasionally in a less strict acceptation. Indeed, unless a term is formed by a negation, as *alam* and *αἰώνιος* are not, it is pretty certain *à priori* that, being human, its primary meaning is not strictly that of everlasting, there not being an everlasting element in human affairs. When once, however, we have got a word *eternal* in full force, it must be taken without abatements, unless these are required by the context; as, for instance, when we say that organ-grinders are *eternal* pests, and that Parliament is *omnipotent*. Here we cannot mean literally eternal and literally omnipotent. The subject precludes all such understanding. But, in the case of damned souls, neither the context nor the wider analogies of the Christian system, warrant us in limiting the force of the passages which declare the pains of the reprobate to be eternal. On the contrary, limitations are forbidden by those other words, "inextinguishable fire," and "undying worm," as also by the synonym for eternity, *in sæcula sæculorum*, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*. Moreover, in the same passage the same word is applied to the eternity of woe as to the eternity of bliss. Upon which identity of term St. Augustine thus argues: "Si utrumque æternum, profecto aut utrumque cum fine dicitur, aut utrumque sine fine perpetuum debet intelligi." Only such an interpretation is reconcileable with the complete, final character assigned to the sentence given on the Day of Judgment; which sentence, moreover, is made to depend on good or evil acts proper to this state of life, and not to the disembodied state after death.<sup>6</sup> Nor does it avail against St. Augustine to quote, as a sentence in which the same word has different meanings, 1 Cor. xv. 22, "as in Adam *all* die, so in Christ *all* shall live again." For, in the first place, Christ, as far as His work was concerned, did purchase for all the glory of a blessed resurrection; and, in the second place, so far as some are in fact to be excepted from the reward, these are manifestly known for exceptions. St. Paul is only comparing here, as in the fifth chapter to the Romans, the one man, Adam, who ruined all, and the one Man, Christ, Who restored all; even though to some Christ's restoring grace is not applied, through no defect on the side of the Redeemer. St. Augustine himself meets another cavil made on the words of Scripture, to the effect that, though the fire itself may be inextinguishable, yet its victims may in time be freed from its devouring jaws:

<sup>6</sup> St. Matt. xxv.; 1 Cor. vi. 9; Apoc. xxi. 8, 27; xxii. 3.

"Neque illud dici hic poterit, ignem æternum dictum, non ipsam pœnam æternam, . . . quum et hoc prævidens Dominus, tanquam Dominus, sententiam suam concluderit dicens, sic ibunt illi in combustionem æternam, justi autem in vitam æternam. Erit ergo æterna combustio sicut ignis." It may also be noted how the Evangelist speaks not merely of fire, but of *their* fire, as something specially pertaining to the sufferers, and, in this its relation, to endure for ever.

As to the second class of texts, we may first of all appeal to the general impression conveyed by a perusal of Scripture, that conduct in this world is alone decisive of future weal or woe. In reliance on the passages which give this view, some have denied the admissibility even of a Purgatory. But real difficulty on this score vanishes utterly with the realization of the difference between mortal and venial sin, and between their respective consequences. In the next life good and bad are for ever sundered, and that from the first. They have grown up together in this world, wheat and tares intermixed; but now they are parted: "Between us and you there is a fixed great chaos; so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, nor from thence come hither."<sup>7</sup> From the moment of death this barrier is fixed. "If the tree shall fall to the north or to the south, in whatsoever place it shall fall, there shall it be."<sup>8</sup> St. Jerome gives the common interpretation of this passage when he says: "Tu, quasi lignum, quamvis longævus sis, non eris in perpetuum, sed subita vi ventorum, ita mortis tempestate subversus, ubicumque cecideris ibi jugiter permanebis, sive te rigidum et truem, sive clementem et misericordem, ultimum invenerit tempus." The same book, in the ninth chapter, gives us the warning, "Whatsoever thy hand is able to do, do it earnestly; for neither work, nor reason, nor wisdom, nor knowledge shall be in Hell, whither thou art hastening." Turning to Ecclesiasticus, we find a like text:<sup>9</sup> "Before thy death work justice; for in Hell there is no finding food." As Christ had this life as the term of His work of redemption, so have we this life as the term of our work, which is to make that redemption our own. Hence we may each repeat after Christ,<sup>10</sup> "I must work the works of Him that sent Me whilst it is day; the night cometh when no man can work." Of this day of life, though he may have a special period of it specially in view,

<sup>7</sup> St. Luke xvi. 26.<sup>8</sup> Eccles. xi. 3.<sup>9</sup> Eccles. xiv. 17.<sup>10</sup> St. John ix. 4.

St. Paul says, "Behold now the acceptable time, behold now the day of salvation."<sup>11</sup> To the same effect he addresses the Galatians:<sup>12</sup> "Every one shall bear his own burden. What things a man shall sow, those also shall he reap. For he that soweth in his flesh, of the flesh also shall he reap corruption. But he that soweth in the spirit, of the spirit also shall reap life everlasting. Whilst we have time, let us work good to all men." It is the constant teaching of Scripture, that our conduct in this world is decisive of our state in the future world. The good or evil deeds specified are often those that are possible in this life alone. See, for instance, the corporal works of mercy referred to in the final judgment of mankind. See also those sins of the flesh, which St. Paul says shall bar all entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven. Refer back, if needful, to the Book of Wisdom,<sup>13</sup> and observe how the earthly career alone discriminates the happy and the wretched. The happy have one test whereby they are known, namely, that they "*die in the Lord*:" "*Beati mortui qui in Domino moriuntur; amodo jam dicet Spiritus requiescant a laboribus suis; opera enim illorum sequuntur illos.*"<sup>14</sup> Their works *follow* them; no future works are effective for salvation. Perseverance to the end is perseverance till death; and then all is saved or else lost. "He that perseveres to the end, he [and he only] shall be saved."<sup>15</sup>

Again, we must say that a doctrine so Catholic and dogmatic as that which teaches probation to be confined to the present life, can never submit to revision, even after "the labours of Professor Maurice." We must always hold with antiquity as represented, for instance, by St. Gregory: "*Quia et futuræ mortis tempus ignoramus, et post mortem operari non possumus, superest ut ante mortem tempora indulta rapiamus.*"<sup>16</sup> It is possible for a doctrine once doubtful afterwards to become, for all believers, dogmatically certain; but for the reverse process to take place, so long as Christ's word stands steady, is quite impossible.

There is just one parable of our Lord that might create some difficulty, where He says that the debtor, cast into prison, shall not go forth till he has paid the last farthing.<sup>17</sup> But we

<sup>11</sup> 2 Cor. vi. 2.<sup>12</sup> Gal. vi. 5.<sup>13</sup> Wisdom iv. and v.<sup>14</sup> Apoc. xiv. 13.<sup>15</sup> St. Matt. x. 22.<sup>16</sup> Hom. iii. in *Evang.*<sup>17</sup> St. Matt. v. 26, xviii. 34; St. Luke xii. 59.

know *aliunde*, that man is incapable of paying the full debt of grave sin ; hence the exit will be never for those dying in guilt that is mortal. Such is St. Jerome's interpretation. "Qui semel illuc ingreditur, ulterius egredi non permittetur. Quod ipsa Veritas in evangelio ostendit dicens: Non exibis inde, donec persolvas novissimum quadrantem. Quemodmodum ibi intelligitur ubi dictum est, oportet eum regnare donec ponat inimicos sub pedibus suis, semper illum regnaturum, quoniam semper illi erunt inimici sub pedibus, ita et hic accipi potest dictum, non exibis donec persolvas, semper non exiturum esse, quia semper solvet novissimum quadrantem dum pœnas sempiternas terrenorum peccatorum luit." Whatever arbitrariness there may, at first sight, appear to be in this interpretation will be removed by a reference to any dissertation on the Scriptural use of the word *donec*.

Though we should demur to the principle, that Catholic exegesis needs confirmation from existent Jewish traditions; yet the latter source may legitimately be applied to for what it can furnish. Dr. Farrar thinks that he has Jewish tradition triumphantly on his side. His fifth Excursus is devoted to the summarizing of what evidence he has been able to gather in behalf of his own case. Dr. Pusey's complaint is that the witnesses brought forward are not those that most deserve a hearing. "Belief in the eternity of future punishment is contained in the fourth book of the Maccabees, in the so-called Psalms of Solomon; the second death is mentioned in the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan; Josephus attests the belief of the Pharisees and the Essenes in the eternity of punishment. The later Jewish authorities, which Dr. Farrar quotes, all come from the disciples of those who had rejected our Lord. The chief were employed in maintaining their ground against the Gospel of Him, Whom their fathers had crucified. They were not representatives of the ancient teaching. Their temple destroyed, themselves banished from their holy city, they had to build up a new righteousness, apart from hope in the Messiah and from sacrifice. Some gave up the hope of a Messiah altogether; some looked only for one who should free them from their earthly masters, and restore their national greatness. Over against Christianity, and to hinder conversions to Jesus, they fenced in their people from straying by dependence upon their privileges as descendants of Abraham, or of those with whom God made a covenant on Mount



Sinai."<sup>18</sup> One privilege which they invented for their own race was, that no Jew should pass more than twelve months in Gehenna.

It may be remarked in addition, how we are under no necessity to prove that, among the Jews, the extent of future punishment was popularly known with that clearness which the New Testament shed upon the subject. There are in the Old Testament plenty of indications of a future existence and of future rewards and punishments. But the mass of the people may not have been well acquainted with particulars as to nature and duration.

II. Dr. Pusey's view of the condemnation of Origenism by the Fifth Œcumenical Council, is open to doubt in detail. Hefele says that we cannot now hope to clear up all historic points. Both authors agree that Origen was condemned in that Council; though the second of them writes: "Not in a special session, nor in the course of a special process, but *transeundo* and *in cumulo*, the name of Origen, in the eleventh anathematism, being put along with that of other heretics."<sup>19</sup> Dr. Pusey, referring to Hefele for his proof, says: "There is no doubt that the name is not a later addition, since it was so read in the Lateran Synod."<sup>20</sup> Mr. Jukes, after throwing doubt on the fact of the condemnation, further questions whether restitutionism was the matter of the condemnation. "Let us look," he urges, "at the Home Synod under Mennas, which without doubt condemned Origen. But for what did it condemn him? Not for the hope of restitution. . . . To this one point, spite of Justinian's express desire that they should condemn it, they make no allusion whatever in any one of the fifteen canons which they passed." On the strength of these assertions Mr. Jukes dares to repeat his challenge: "When and where did the Catholic Church ever authoritatively condemn the view of restitution? At what council and in what decrees received by East and West?"

Not to enter into the history of those anathematisms, which history has its confessedly obscure points, we may reply, first of all, no matter if a Council never formally condemned Origenism, the daily teaching of the Church is by itself sufficient condemnation. Origen himself was so aware of the strangeness of his views, that he put them forth tentatively and with the greatest misgiving. When speaking in conformity with the ordinary views

<sup>18</sup> P. 48.<sup>19</sup> *Conciliengeschichte*, ii. p. 837.<sup>20</sup> P. 133.

of his time, he unqualifiedly endorsed the opposite doctrine; and he admitted it to be the Christian teaching when he had to answer Celsus, who attacked it as such. Secondly, the novel suggestions were speedily condemned, in the case of the Nitrian monks, by a Synod held at Alexandria under Theophilus (399 A.D.). At the Synod of Diospolis, Pelagius witnessed to the common faith of the Church, by calling "Origenists" any who should dispute the eternity of punishment. A like condemnation was passed at a Synod held on the Isle of Cyprus by St. Epiphanius; as also by a Synod at Rome, held under Pope Anastasius, who approved the sentence passed in the East. To suit Mr. Jukes we will waive the question of the Synod under Mennas at Constantinople. As the consequence of the Church's opposition, "the heresies in Origen's book," says Dr. Pusey, "were for the time silenced. No one any more uttered them. . . . [The condemnations of the several Synods] were accepted by the Church, and the Church had rest. No one maintained, even hesitatingly, what the Church had condemned." <sup>21</sup>

Without for a moment allowing that Mr. Jukes has proved his point about the Fifth Œcumenical Council, it will be well to remind him that, before uttering his challenge, he should have seen that no other Œcumenical Councils stood in his way. What will he say of the Fourth Lateran Council? "*Omnes cum suis resurgent corporibus, ut recipient secundum opera sua, sive bona fuerint sive mala; illi cum diabolo pœnam perpetuam, et isti cum Christo gloriam sempiternam.*" On our principles, this Council was œcumenical in the true sense. Probably, Mr. Jukes will deny that it was œcumenical; it being held after the separation of East and West. At any rate, he cannot deny that the East was in the fullest accord with the West on the eternity of punishment; and that in this case both parties witness to the dogma. Moreover, the Patriarch of Constantinople was present at the Council, as well as the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and Antioch. But, it is fair to add, Constantinople was at that time under the Latins, and it was the Latin Patriarch who was present. The Greeks, too, from the account of Leo Allatius, may have exaggerated the power of prayer for the lost. Again, what of the Council of Trent, in its incidental teaching? "*Si quis dixerit justum in quolibet opere bono peccare, atque ideo*

<sup>21</sup> P. 132.

poenas æternas mereri, anathema sit."<sup>22</sup> If the decrees of Councils are not more numerous than they are, and if some of them are quoted more for what they imply than for what they explicitly define, the reason is that the doctrine of the eternity of punishment was too fully recognized to need that mode of enforcement which is proper to dogmas that are seriously attacked. But if this be so, it is said, why are the creeds silent? The Athanasian Creed is not silent. Moreover, in the general article on future life, the fate of the wicked in particular was included. "When the creed was explained," says Dr. Pusey, "*eternal death* was an article mentioned, as contained in it, by minds as different as St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ruffinus, St. Maximus, St. Peter Chrysologus."<sup>23</sup> We will give a passage from the first-named Father, who in his Catechetical Sermons on the Creed has these words: "Though the resurrection is common to all men, it is not alike to all. For we all, indeed, receive everlasting bodies, but not all the same bodies. The just receive them, that through eternity they may join the choirs of angels; but the sinners, that they may undergo for everlasting the torment of their sins. . . . If a man is a sinner, he shall receive an eternal body fitted to endure the pains of sin, that it may burn eternally in fire, and never be consumed." This is a plain exposition of the creed, intelligible to the people, and not likely to have been well received by them, had they thought it peculiar to the catechist with a few of his friends.

III. Dr. Pusey begins the evidence from tradition by a wide-ranging collection of the utterances of the early martyrs, who often nerved themselves to undergo the shorter pains of their conflict by recounting the eternal pains of Hell, which were the punishment of apostasy. "These sayings attest the faith of all classes. There were bishops among them. . . . There were also boys and girls; men and women of noble birth, and men living by their business; matrons and widows with abundance of this world's goods, and sons to suffer with them or to be left behind; women aforesometimes unhappily notorious for their evil lives, and virgins devoted to Christ; men of gentle birth, who had been popular as magicians, veteran soldiers. Every nation, Latin, Greek, West African, Egyptian, Goth, Persian, had its witness to Christ [and to Christ's teaching about hell-fire] among the noble army of martyrs."<sup>25</sup> Of the Fathers it is well known, how very largely preponderant is their

<sup>22</sup> Sess. vi. can. 3.      <sup>23</sup> P. 283.      <sup>25</sup> P. 150.

testimony to the eternity of damnation. Dr. Pusey gives about one hundred pages of such witness. As to the few names quoted on the other side, their force is weakened by the obscurity of some of the passages, and by the fact that elsewhere and commonly the same Fathers teach just what the rest of the Patristic body taught. Even Origen himself has said more for eternal punishment than against it.

We may speak more at length of prayer for the damned as sanctioned by antiquity.<sup>26</sup> St. Thomas accepts the story of Trajan being rescued from Hell by the prayers of St. Gregory: though some evade the force of the example by questioning whether Trajan was supposed ever actually to have entered on the state of condemnation. St. John Damascene credits as well the above-mentioned rescue, as another of the like kind wrought by the prayers of St. Thecla. And, going still further back, we find St. Augustine tolerating the narrative of the deliverance of St. Perpetua's brother. A number of such stories are on record,<sup>27</sup> though we may despair of authenticating any of them. Certainly there is no obligation to put faith in them. Still the inquiry presses, how could grave authors allow of any violation of the law, "in inferno nulla est redemptio"? The principle is given by St. Thomas, that God may make exceptions to His own rules. "*Alia sunt quæ lege communi accidunt, et alia quæ singulariter ex privilegio aliquibus conceduntur.*"<sup>28</sup> Suarez concurs, saying that the general rule is revealed, but that whether God makes any exceptions to it, is a controverted point.<sup>29</sup> Certainly impunity in sin is not the lesson to be read from the words of these theologians. The exceptions are exceedingly doubtful as facts, and, at best, not likely to be numerous. Nor is it right, from the above example, to suppose that all God's laws may suffer exceptions, though no authority is given for the supposition. It was a strong instinct, and in its way a correct instinct, against such gratuitous hypotheses, that made many well-meaning souls resist the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. Only the Divine warrant for the fact of Mary's exemption from a very stringent general law, justified the assertion of her privilege. Short, however, of complete rescue of souls from Hell, there is the mitigation of their sufferings through the prayers of the faithful. In support of such miti-

<sup>26</sup> M. Emery has a copious dissertation on this subject, which we have used.

<sup>27</sup> Estius in lib. iv. sent. d. 46.

<sup>28</sup> D. 45. q. 2. a. 2. ad 5am.

<sup>29</sup> *De Peccat.* d. 7, s. 5.

gation, notwithstanding what the Gospel says of the refusal of all solace from Lazarus to Dives, are quoted St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, Prudentius, St. John Damascene, Innocent the Third, Peter Lombard, and many theologians up to Albert the Great and St. Thomas, after whose time the negative opinion has prevailed. The last-named does not wholly condemn the view which he himself does not approve. "*Dicimus sine prejudicio melioris sententiæ, quod illa quæ dicit quod suffragia non prosint damnatis probabilior est, et magis consonat divinis eloquiis.*" How strongly many members of the Greek Church held the mitigation theory is brought out by abundant evidences. Nor did the Latin Fathers at the Council of Florence resist this view, as propounded there by Mark of Ephesus, perhaps, because it was not the vital question of the moment. The same opinion also is undoubtedly expressed in certain old forms of prayer; though it is not necessary nor even correct to look in this light on our own Offertory in Masses for the Dead.

Now-a-days the prevalent doctrine of theologians is against the power of our suffrages to help the damned. Petavius in his day tolerated the old view; while Suarez said, that the negative decision, though not absolutely of faith, yet was *fidei proxima*. "For, besides that it is the common teaching of Fathers and theologians, it is also very consonant with the words of Scripture."<sup>30</sup> Estius is pretty much of the same mind. But there is no authentic definition pronounced on the matter; and we do not wish to frame a private definition. Always, however, we recognize that progressive character of the Church's theology which has full sanction from all exponents of legitimate development. No dogma ever rises to the requirements of a matter of Catholic belief, and then is stripped of its dignity. Neither, on the other side, is any dogma really new. But points once controverted may, with or without sentence from the supreme tribunal, be finally set beyond further dispute. If ever the utter impotence of prayer to relieve lost souls acquires such certainty, or if it has already acquired it, then the dogma will not stand alone in that once it was a controverted question, and, perhaps, had opinion—nothing more than opinion—preponderantly against its claims.

What at various times has been written by Catholics in explanation of Christ's preaching to the dead, does not stand in the way of anything that is matter of obligatory belief.

<sup>30</sup> In 3 p. D. 48, S. 4, n. 14.



Lastly, the obduracy or confirmation in evil, which theologians attribute to the damned, so far as its tendency goes, is wholly in favour of no change of condition. The wicked are confirmed in sin as the blessed are in goodness. Both classes have freely chosen their lot. Mere ignorance or mere circumstances never damned a man yet, though they may have made his probation harder. This doctrine the Church holds as tenaciously as she holds the fact of eternal punishment itself. She challenges any man to give strict proof by reason, either that the first probation is unjust, or that, failing the first, God is rigorously bound to give a second. Man is created naturally immortal; good and evil are set before him; he is free and, therefore, chooses as he likes; but his choice, after death, is put out of the possibility of retractation. The alternative is very awful. But that is reason for making the election wisely, not for blaspheming God, and so meriting the lot that all were warned to shun as they would shun nothing else.

### *Dr. Lee and the Order of Corporate Reunion.*

SOME time since it was bruited about among Catholics that certain Anglican clergymen, anxious to remove from their communion the slur of Orders at least doubtful in their validity, had obtained from undeniable bishops acknowledged to be such by all the world, not only ordination as priests, but consecration as bishops, and that in virtue of their newly acquired dignity they invited any Anglican clergyman, who had the faintest doubt about the validity of his Orders, to come to them and be made an unquestionable *bond fide* sacrificing priest. How they got their consecration was a mystery. One story was, that in order to avoid any difficulties about local jurisdiction, they had persuaded three bishops, one Greek, one Jansenist, the other (so it was alleged) a Roman, to set sail with them on a vessel engaged for the purpose, and that when they were well arrived in mid-ocean, rocked on the bosom of the boundless deep, the ceremony took place by reason of which they returned ready to defy all comers who denied to them the sacred gifts which are the characteristic of the priest. The mere fact that they were said to claim as one of their consecrators a bishop obedient to the Holy See, showed that there was some flaw in the story; no Catholic bishop could perform such an act without thereby forfeiting his allegiance to Rome, and we imagine that they would have had to search all the world through without finding an episcopal apostate to perform the ceremony. But there was a general agreement that the account was true so far as this: that three notable Anglican clergymen had by hook or by crook been introduced by some means or other into the true priesthood, and that the hands of Oriental or Jansenist bishop, true though schismatic bishop, had been laid on their heads, and had conferred on them the power of validly (not lawfully) offering the Sacrifice of the Mass. It was also the general impression that one, if not all the three, had become bishops, and the sees were mentioned

(ancient British sees, if we remember right) to which they had attached themselves.

Time passed on, and amid the rush of modern life the story slumbered, or was remembered only in a narrow section of Anglicans. But it received confirmation from time to time. Some hesitating soul wavering between truth and error, searching after the light but unable as yet to discern the light of Pentecost from the counterfeit imitations of modern heresy, had sought out one or other of these clergymen accredited with a true episcopate. He laid before them his doubts about Anglicanism, and they sought to re-assure him by telling him that if he did not feel confident of the fact of episcopal succession in the Church of England, he need not forsake the Church of his Baptism, or stoop his neck to the yoke of a foreign ecclesiastic, for that they too, Englishmen and Anglicans, possessed those sacred powers after which he sought, and could adduce proofs of their consecration which the most bigoted Roman could not and dare not deny.

A new society too was set on foot under their guidance, and was called the Order of Corporate Reunion. It consisted of men of extreme views among Anglicans, but at the same time it was from the first the object of bitter attack on the part of the Ritualists. They impeached its members as traitors to Anglo-Catholicism. No wonder, for these foes within the fold had ventured to enounce the monstrous proposition that Apostolical succession in the Church of England was, to say the least, extremely shaky, and Anglican Sacraments, in consequence, still less reliable. Even Baptism, they said, was so often carelessly administered or omitted altogether, that on this ground alone there would be a strong suspicion against those other sacraments to which Baptism is a necessary preliminary. We cannot be surprized that the High Church and Ritualist party regarded this new sect as having betrayed the citadel to the foe, as having yielded to Rome just those very vantage points the possession of which alone gave Anglicanism the power to hold her own against the pretensions or claims of Ultramontaniam.

For some time this warfare has been smouldering. The Order of Corporate Reunion have quietly kept their new won powers in the background, and have practised a wise economy when questioned. They have been few in number, and the position they occupied was such an exceptional one that they

were not worth attacking, except by such random shots as their co-religionists fired at them in their obscurity. But lately one of the ablest of them comes forward in the *Nineteenth Century* with an article in many ways of interest to Catholics, and which we cannot pass over unnoticed. It is a curious sign of the times, and of the spirit which is developing itself more and more in Anglicanism. It is in some ways a curious disclosure, and the theory which is put forward as justifying the position of the Order of Corporate Reunion is really so ingenious and yet so unreal that even if our readers have read Dr. Lee's article, we are not certain that they will do him justice, unless they are acquainted with other manifestoes he has lately put forward. They will be inclined to look upon him as a wild unpractical dreamer, as an eccentric impugner of the religion of which he is a minister, and they will not discern his real position, or appreciate how the curious proceedings which he describes as having been enacted by the new society are an evidence that he and many with him are in their secret souls yearning after truth and desiring to find themselves in communion with the saints of God, though unfortunately they will not enter in by the door, but seek to climb up some other way into the fold. We therefore propose in our present article to try and state clearly Dr. Lee's position as fairly as we can. If we misunderstand him, we hope he will set us right. And we shall try and state with equal clearness the unfortunate weakness in that position, which renders null all the elaborate measures taken to render it "impregnably Catholic," and leaves the members of the Order of Corporate Reunion in a worse position if possible than those poor Protestants from whom they are so anxious to differentiate themselves.

The Order of Corporate Reunion was formally constituted at a solemn synod held in London in 1877. All legal and liturgical formalities were duly observed. Mass was said previously in English after the Salisbury rite, not (here we quote Dr. Lee's words) according to the "mongrel, mutilated, and bald service for the Lord's Supper now in public use." After Mass the synod held its solemn sitting. Each member of it was conditionally baptized, and after due discussion a manifesto or pastoral was agreed to, setting forth the aim and object of the new Order, that it was established partly to protest against existing evils, such as the royal supremacy as at present exercised, the mode of appointment of bishops with the sacri-

legious pretence of election and confirmation attaching to it, the abolition of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, the recognition of divorce, and the subordination of the temporal to the spiritual introduced by the Public Worship Regulation Act. But it had a more important function to secure to its members, the validity of the sacraments of which they might be the ministers or recipients. "If report be accurate," says Dr. Lee, speaking as if he himself had not been a prominent member of the assembly, "nothing sacramental was left undone," which he afterwards explains to mean, or rather leaves us to infer, that confirmation followed next, and Orders for all those who had been previously admitted into the Anglican ministry by Anglican bishops. He tells us that after Baptism, *sub conditione*, "a similar practice (*sic*) would logically ensue in all sacraments which impart a character." We do not quite see that any repetition was made necessary by the fact of the character. But let this pass.

The justification of these proceedings is to be found chiefly in the carelessness and laxity with which Baptism is administered among Anglicans, and the numerous cases where it is not administered at all. Dr. Newman is quoted, bearing witness that it would be difficult for him to deny that every now and then an Anglican Bishop is a consecrator who had never been baptized. Various statistics are adduced, showing that in some large towns the proportion of Baptisms to births is under one half, and that the rite is sometimes so negligently administered that its validity is more than doubtful. In the last century it was very questionable, says Mr. Bennett of Frome, whether the water when used did really touch the person of the child meant to be baptized. All this is perfectly true, and we ourselves have heard an Anglican clergyman relate how his predecessor in a country parish used to baptize from a lofty reading-desk, and sprinkled with random aim the children held in the arms of their mothers or sponsors beneath. "Such negligence," says Dr. Lee (and his inference is a perfectly just one), "renders every act in the work of ordination uncertain." Anglican Bishops, even supposing their ordinations otherwise valid, were not in the habit of asking for the baptismal certificates of candidates for ordination, and no unbaptized person can be validly ordained.

Besides this, the Order recognized the great desirability of possessing Orders which Roman Catholics and Greeks cannot



question. Ever since the abolition of the old English Ordinals, says Dr. Lee, Anglican ordinations notoriously *have* been questioned. He allows the justice of the questioning, and quotes the testimony of a High Church Bishop to the probable invalidity of the consecration of three Anglican Bishops in which he had himself taken part. "The defective acts and official slovenliness of Dr. Sumner (independently of any question of Baptism), has rendered it more than probable that the three consecrations in questions were—from a Catholic standing-point—simply null and void, wanting in the outward form." We can tell Dr. Lee another story to confirm his opinion. An Anglican Bishop, now deceased, used after his Ordinations to call the newly-ordained into his study, and solemnly to warn them. "Remember, gentlemen, that I have not in any sense made of you sacrificing priests." With such an explicit intention in the mind of the Bishop, what Anglican can claim for these neo-ordinati a true priesthood?

So far we quite agree with Dr. Lee and the Order of Corporate Reunion in their recognition of existing evils and of the need of a remedy. The question is whether the remedy adopted by the Order of Corporate Reunion is an effective and a satisfactory one. This question can only be answered by examining what is the end which is aimed at, and whether the means adopted to attain that end, were calculated to bring it about, and to bring it about lawfully. Now, from the name of the new body we are discussing, we gather that their object is to place themselves in such a position as may qualify them to ask or claim of the Holy See a recognition of them as true Catholics, and therefore as having a right to intercommunion. We cannot do them the injustice to suppose that they are content to rest in the possession (if they possess them) of certain supernatural gifts, in the powers of an undoubted priesthood, or even in the consecrating power of the episcopacy. These, if we understand them aright, are but stepping-stones to something higher—to that unity after which they yearn; they desire them because they desire to be complete Catholics, not mutilated Catholics, as we imagine they would at present allow many Anglicans to be, even when they are really Catholics through duly-administered Baptism; mutilated by reason of invalid ordination, with all the fatal consequences that flow from it; mutilated, too, in some sense, by reason of their non-recognition by the Roman Church, with the many disadvantages which such non-recognition carries with it.

Here, then, is the first point to be examined. Is the action of the Order of Corporate Reunion conducive to reunion? Does it make its members Catholics in any sense in which they were not Catholics before? Does it promote in any manner the "Unity of Christendom?" We are quite ready to concede to Dr. Lee that the administration of Baptism is not only *janua sacramentorum* but also *janua ecclesiæ*; that no one is a member of the Visible Church of Christ who has not been lawfully baptized; that every little child, by whomsoever baptized, has a share of the supernatural gifts and graces which are vested by Jesus Christ in His Visible Church on earth; that if it dies before it attains the age of reason it will be received into the bosom of God, and will enjoy the Beatific Vision to all eternity. Nay, we will go further than this. Not only is that little child united to Jesus Christ while still an infant by the supernatural ties of faith and charity, but after he has grown up, so long as he commits no mortal sin, he remains still united to Him, even though, through inculpable ignorance, he call himself Greek, Jansenist, Anglican, Methodist, Plymouth Brother, Wesleyan, or any other of the many names which divide those who are outside the pale of Rome; and he has after his death a claim to that reward which God has prepared for all who love Him. He is, in other words, a member of the Invisible Church of Christ. But all this time he does not remain a member of the Visible Church. From the first moment when he, after attaining the age of reason, disowned, though ignorantly, his allegiance to the Holy See, from that moment he ceased to belong to that visible corporate Body which Christ founded on earth, and he lost all those privileges and graces and blessings which belong only to members of that Church. He forfeited, though inculpably, his share in the gifts which our Lord left to His Visible Church on earth. He deprived himself, though through no fault of his own, of all those aids to sanctity which God gives only to those who recognize and obey His Vicar on earth. He ceased—and here it is that Dr. Lee deceives himself—to be a Catholic, or to have Catholic privileges, though he did not cease to be in a state of grace, a true and faithful follower of Jesus Christ, supposing always that his ignorance was invincible and that he had committed no other mortal sin.

Here—if we may turn aside for a moment from our immediate subject—we would direct the attention of our readers to two important considerations connected with what we have said.

The first is that it is a very difficult task (and one very rarely accomplished) for any one, even for a baptized Christian, to avoid serious sin in this abnormal position outside the Catholic Church. The aids to holiness in the Church are so numerous, so incalculable in extent and efficacy, that the loss of them puts the baptized Protestant at a terrible disadvantage in his contest with evil. It is true he has the internal aid of the supernatural grace infused at his baptism, but he lacks all the external graces which flow into the soul of the Catholic every time he hears Mass, goes to Confession, receives Holy Communion, devoutly makes the Sign of the Cross, kneels at Benediction, performs any of the acts of piety so richly strewn over the life of Catholics. His supply of strength to walk in the ways of God, to resist his passions, to increase in the love of Him, to practise unselfish charity to others, is maimed and weakened. He fights an unequal battle, and few indeed are those who fight successfully to the end. Of those few a large proportion are rewarded by God for their faithfulness to grace by the removal of the veil from their eyes, so that, sooner or later, they recognize and submit to that mighty Mother whom before they had ignorantly blasphemed. Those who die in good faith as Protestants, and die unstained by mortal sin, are the exception, not the rule, and a very rare exception.

The second consideration is, that even in this rare case of a non-Catholic remaining faithful to the last to the grace of his baptism, he scarcely can attain to any high degree of sanctity. There may be good men among those Anglicans or other Protestants who are invincibly ignorant, but there can hardly be saints of heroic sanctity. Vainly do Greeks and Anglicans search for a member of their communion qualified for canonization. Even the best of them are but very ordinary sort of beings after all. We cannot expect a strong hearty man where his food is scant and mixed with a large amount of rubbish or wash. A Protestant, if he struggles through, is no spiritual athlete: even where, in spite of the false teaching of his sect, he retains the love of God in his heart, that love almost necessarily burns with a faint flame.

To return. We say, then, that this baptized Christian who has, without any fault on his part, given in his submission to no external authority at all, or to any self-made authority outside the communion of Peter, is not a member of the Visible Church of Christ, and therefore is not a Catholic. The spiritual powers he may have gained possession of make him no more a Catholic

than he was before. If he, as a layman, receives the true Body and Blood of Christ our Lord, if he makes his confession to a true priest, if he receives confirmation from a real bishop, he is not a whit more a Catholic thereby. The Holy See will recognize him not a whit the more. He is in no better position for intercommunion. If he, as a priest, can validly say Mass, or confirm, or even ordain priests or consecrate bishops, he is not a whit more a Catholic priest; nay, he is, as we shall see presently, rather further than he was before from being one. Utterly futile, then, is the attempt—we will hope the well-meant attempt—to draw near to the Church by gaining possession of some of the powers left by our Lord to His Church. We feel sure that all members of the Order of Corporate Reunion earnestly desire to promote the unity of Christendom; but the fact of their being certainly baptized, certainly true communicants, or even certainly and undoubtedly true priests and bishops, brings them not one inch nearer to the end that they desire.

But there is a further and still more important question to be answered. If the attempt is futile, is it at least harmless? for if it is, we may indeed smile at it, but let it alone as the amiable weakness of a few well-meaning and energetic men who are making an experiment, though a failure, which we may regret, but which we sympathize with and even applaud. This, however, is not at all the case. The action taken by the Order of Corporate Reunion if it is correctly reported, is in itself not merely ineffective in the direction of reunion, but a direct bar to it—not merely a vain attempt to heal a schism, but it is the creation of a new schism—not merely a delusion on the part of its promoters, but a fearful sacrilege. We write these words with pain; but it is no kindness to hide the truth from Dr. Lee and his associates. We must tell them solemnly and deliberately that they are (unless, indeed, as we hope and pray, they are acting in invincible ignorance) incurring guilt, of which they can have but a faint conception. If the unordained Anglican clergy are to be pitied when they say their empty words over their bread and wine—if the Anglican bishop is performing a futile ceremony when he places his hands on the head of his “candidates for ordination”—if Anglican confirmation leaves no “character”—if the words of absolution come from the lips of one who has no more right to utter them than any of the laymen around—how much more are those to be pitied who, uncalled, unsent, unauthorized, here thrust themselves into the holy office of the

priesthood! Each time they say a valid Mass, each time Christ, true to His promise, descends at their bidding upon the altar, each time their hands handle their Lord and their God, they are guilty—we say it with hesitation, but it is better to tell the truth—of an awful insult to their God. We will hope that they are acting in ignorance—that for them the prayer can be validly offered, “Father forgive them, for they know not what they do;” but whether in ignorance or not, each Communion service they repeat, each priestly act they exercise, is, at least, material sacrilege—our Lord’s Sacred Body is placed in the hands of the schismatic and heretic. His Sacred Blood is consumed by those whom He not only recognizes as none of His, but who, unwilling to submit to His lawful Vicar on earth, unwilling to obey His representatives, have sought out those who outrage Him by their abuse of the sacred powers of the priesthood, to enable them to misuse those powers and to multiply those outrages. To remedy one schism they create another, and in many respects a worse one. Is this to promote the unity of Christendom? Nay, rather it is to inflict a fresh rent. Is this to bring the dead branch once more into union with the living tree? Nay, it is but to break it afresh, even though the new fragment be decked out with leaves and flowers not its own, but stolen from the living tree and united somehow to the dry stick, to cover thereby its utter barrenness.

We ask ourselves how Dr. Lee will attempt to clear himself from so grave a charge. We know his ability and earnestness, and desire to do justice, as far as possible, to his view of the question. We imagine that he will say: “I am *not* out of communion with Rome. I acknowledge the Pope as my lawful superior and myself as a Roman priest. True, I obey the Anglican Bishop of Canterbury, but only so far as he does not run counter to Rome. When, therefore, I ask an undoubted bishop to reordain me conditionally, I am only putting myself in that position which my lawful superior, the Pope, would wish me to be in. I am guilty of no fresh schism, and therefore of no sacrilege. I am a Catholic because a baptized Christian, paying due allegiance to Rome. As to Rome and Canterbury (here we quote his very words) I reject the lawful claims of neither, and acknowledge the legitimate claims of both. By right of my baptism I am a fellow Christian of the bishops of each, and as far as I am aware, have been cut off from com-



munion by neither. No baptized person, in fact, *can* be cut off from the Mystical body of Christ, except by a lawful and canonical personal process."<sup>1</sup>

We have already answered this plea, at least indirectly. Without escaping from the jurisdiction of the Church, the baptized person may forfeit his communion with her in two ways: either the bond may be severed for him by a canonical sentence, or without judicial process he may cut himself loose by his own act alone. Such an act is the open profession of heresy or of schism. If I knowingly and deliberately assert any proposition condemned by Rome as heretical; if I not merely with my lips, but with my heart and knowing what I am about, join in the worship of those whom Rome solemnly declares to be in schism or heresy; if I allow a heretical or schismatic bishop who has cast off his allegiance to the Holy See to confirm or ordain me; if I receive Holy Communion from his hands in church or chapel, I thereby cut myself off from the Visible Church of Christ; I throw off my allegiance to Rome; I am (culpably or inculpably) a renegade, and must be reconciled to the Church by lawful authority. All this Dr. Lee has done again and again. He has committed hundreds, thousands of overt acts, by which he has forfeited his allegiance. An Anglican clergyman who says that he obeys the Pope is a contradiction in terms. If he means what he says, let him ask the Pope whether his position is a justifiable one. It is hard to understand how an able and earnest man can fancy himself in communion with his lawful superior the Pope, when he knows all the time that the Pope will tell him at once that he is outside the fold of Christ. It is a strange thing to keep out of the Pope's way and to say that because the Pope has never declared him to be excommunicate and in schism, therefore he is neither one nor the other. Will he ask the Pope and abide by the decision of His Holiness? If he will, if with loyal obedience he will submit unreservedly to whatever the See of Rome may decree respecting him, then—and not till then—we shall recognize him as a true Catholic.

But we are very much afraid that in spite of Dr. Lee's personal declaration of loyalty to His Holiness, he would not find his fellow Reunionists agree with him. They still fall back in their official Pastoral on the old subterfuge of a General Council as a final court of appeal. *Ecce caudam serpentiam!* If they had done naught else to cut themselves off from the communion

<sup>1</sup> *Order out of Chaos.* By F. G. Lee, D.D. p. 42.

of the faithful, this would be enough and more than enough. Such an appeal not only runs in the teeth of the decrees of half a dozen Popes, but has been condemned by the Bishops of the Universal Church sitting in full Council. It was first condemned by Pius the Second in 1459 in the Bull *Execrabilis*, then again by Sixtus the Fourth, and again by Julius the Second. The superiority of the Pope to a General Council has not only been acknowledged by the consentient Church, which has accepted no decrees save those confirmed by the Holy See, but it has been asserted over and over again by Nicholas the First, Leo the Ninth, by the Fourth Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, by Innocent the Eleventh, Alexander the Eighth, Pius the Sixth, and finally by the Vatican Council, which asserts that those err from the right path of truth who say that it is lawful to appeal from the Pope to a General Council as to an authority superior to him, and defines under anathema the full and supreme power of jurisdiction possessed by the Holy See, not only in matters relating to faith and morals, but also in those which pertain to the faith and discipline of the Church.

Any one, therefore, who denies the supreme jurisdiction of the Pope, announces himself *ipso facto* outside the Church's pale. Any one who says that it is lawful to appeal to a General Council, wanders thereby from the paths of truth into those of deadly error. He may believe in the Seven Sacraments, in Transubstantiation, in the Supremacy of the Holy See, in Purgatory, in the Immaculate Conception, in all those doctrines which are supposed to be distinctive of Rome. He may say many prayers to our Lady, he may invoke every saint in the calendar, he may be validly baptised, validly confirmed, nay, a valid priest or even bishop, yet as long as he asserts knowingly and deliberately one single proposition, formally condemned by the Holy See, as long as he does not submit in all things his judgment to the *ex cathedrâ* judgments of the Pope, as long as he denies that the Pope is infallible whenever he speaks from the Chair of Peter, he simply adds (always excepting the case of invincible ignorance) to the guilt of heresy and schism, fresh guilt, fresh sin by all these sacrilegious communions, by each of these sacrilegious exercises of power which Christ confided for its lawful exercise only to those who are obedient to the See of Peter. It is well that Ritualists should understand these two points. A Catholic

is not a man who believes certain doctrines or who possesses certain supernatural powers, but a man who submits himself *ex animo* to the decrees of the Holy See, yielding them a true interior assent. A Catholic is not even a man who recognizes the Pope as his Superior whom he is bound to obey, unless the obedience which he is prepared to yield is an obedience of the intellect to every dogma which the Pope has defined or shall hereafter define in the exercise of Pastor and Doctor of the Universal Church; and those dogmas he must regard not only as true but as infallibly true, that is, as having their truth guaranteed and secured by the infallible guidance of the Holy Spirit. There are no degrees of Catholicity beginning from the infidel or Puritan up to the Anglo-Catholic or Greek. Every living man must be one thing or the other—Catholic or heretic. If we suppose the Order of Corporate Reunion to assemble themselves into a Congregation apart from the rest of the Anglican Communion, if we suppose all their pastors to be priests and their sacraments true sacraments, if the Mass is said daily in their churches and they receive the true Body and Blood of Christ, if their priests have the character of a real valid ordination, they are not one whit thereby the more true Catholics than the Society of Friends or the Calvinistic Methodists. They are no more qualified for communion with Rome than the veriest Puritan.

Not only is this the case, but they are positively in a worse position if they have true sacraments. We sometimes hear them say, "If I did not believe that our Lord was truly present in the (Anglican) Sacrament, I would at once join the Church of Rome." A strange argument indeed! If He were present there, this would be one reason the more for quitting a sect where sacrilegious hands use validly but unlawfully the sacred and supernatural gifts of the priesthood. If the statements respecting the Order of Corporate Reunion are correct, He is present whenever one of the Anglican clergymen belonging to it repeats their Mass or Communion, and so far from this being a tie which brings them near to the Church Catholic, the very thought of the King of Heaven present in their presumptuous heads makes every Catholic shudder or turn away from them. The Philistines were none the more Jews because the ark of God was present among them. So far from it being a benefit to them, it was a curse. Our Lord's presence at Bethlehem was no source of grace or blessing to the Bethlehemites who turned

their back on our Lady and despised St. Joseph. To the little Innocents indeed it was (like the valid baptism of the Order of Corporate Reunion) *janua cæli*, but to their disobedient parents it brought nothing but misery and woe.

Once more we repeat that what the Order of Corporate Reunion have really done is simply to found a new schism, to add, culpably or inculpably, a new kind of sect to the countless foes of Holy Church. Only God, who sees the hearts of men, knows what was the spirit which was present among them in their first synod. Probably, as in most of such gatherings, there was a mixture of good and evil—some good men, with the love of God in their hearts, longing and yearning after unity; others filled full with pride and the spirit of schism, seeking (how vainly!) to make their way into the Fold without that humble submission which is the only door of the Catholic Church to those who have grown up outside her pale. God knows His own. Some of this new Order (and we hope and pray that Dr. Lee may be their Coryphæus) will come to make their submission—their uncompromising, unconditional submission—to that Chair of Peter to which many of them (and here we can confidently assert that Dr. Lee is of their number) are casting wistful glances of hope. Others we know will go on throwing their stones at random at Catholics, Ritualists, and Puritans alike, and to the end of the story will remain intruders into the sanctuary of the Most High, sacrilegiously consecrating the Body and Blood of Christ, not only present at, but taking a part in, the Supper of the Lamb, though, indeed, without that marriage garment which is in the exclusive keeping of the Church founded on the Rock of Peter.

R. F. CLARKE.

## Catholic Review.

---

### REVIEWS.

1. *Vie de M. Dupont.* Par l'Abbé Janvier. Tours : à l'Oratoire de la Sainte Face. Paris : Larcher.

MOST Catholics of the present day have heard of the rapidly increasing devotion to the Sacred Face of our Lord, of which Tours is the recognized centre, but which has spread itself to other parts of France, and reached even our own shores. A Confraternity of the Holy Face has been established, the object of which is threefold. (1) To repair the outrages committed against the Divine Majesty by blasphemy, the profanation of Sundays, and the feasts of the Church. (2) To obtain the conversion of those who offend God by these acts of blasphemy and profanation. (3) To preserve youth and Christian families from the miserable effects of such scandals. The means by which these objects are to be attained are by a special *cultus* of adoration, prayer, and love to the Face of our Lord, outraged and disfigured in His Passion.

Pius the Ninth, when he approved the Confraternity, asked to be enrolled as the first of its associate members, and uttered remarkable words, which are taken as a sort of motto by the Confraternity: *L'œuvre de la Réparation est destinée à sauver la Société.* Its members now amount to hundreds of thousands in all parts of the world, and it seems destined to play an important part in the future history of the Church.

The chief agent in spreading the devotion to the Holy Face was the holy man whose interesting life is contained in the volume before us. M. Dupont was a French gentleman who lived and died in the midst of the world and worldly society, and yet who attained to a high and heroic degree of sanctity. The son of a Breton proprietor, forced to emigrate by the Revolution, he was born in Martinique in 1797, and at the age of twenty-one came to Paris, where for a time he joined in the fashionable



life of the *jeunesse dorée* of France, though he never lapsed into its vices or relinquished the practice of his religion. But the frivolities of Parisian society soon palled upon him, and the interior whisper of conscience told him that he was born for higher things. For a time he resisted the grace of God, but little by little one apparently chance incident and then another threw him in the way of pious souls and of works of mercy, and the generous heart of the young man felt within him that irresistible attraction to things Divine which God pours into the heart of those on whom He has fixed His glance of special love. At the age of twenty-four he wished to enter St. Sulpice, but God had another path to sanctity prepared for him. His parents objected to the proposal, and in 1821 he returned to Martinique. After living there a most edifying life for some years as a magistrate of the island, he again proposed to his mother that he should become a priest. But he was at this time the head of the family. His mother urged on him the duty of remaining in the world, and after taking the advice of a good priest, he assented to her wishes, and in 1827 married. His wife lived but six years, and in 1833 he returned with his little daughter to France, and settled at Tours.

From this time we may date his more rapid progress on the road to perfection. His special vocation was to make reparation to Almighty God for the insults and outrages offered to His Divine Majesty, and he set about the task with a holy audacity, a virtuous indignation, which set at nought every personal consideration. One day as he was travelling by diligence, the coachman began to blaspheme the Holy Name of God. M. Dupont at once raised his strong arm and struck the offender a vigorous blow. The man turned round in a rage. "What do you mean, sir, by insulting me in that way?" "On the contrary, my friend, it is you who have insulted me. What do *you* mean by insulting my Father?" "Your Father, sir?" "Yes, my Father in Heaven." And M. Dupont proceeded to show him how unworthy it was of a Frenchman and a Christian to utter such words against the Divine Majesty of their common Father in Heaven. Before the end of the journey he had gained the poor man's heart, and the result was a complete change of life.

It was a Carmelite nun, Sister Saint Pierre, who first directed M. Dupont to that special devotion to the Sacred Face, of which she was the first founder, though it was by his means that it took root in France and is increasing continually day by day,

and is now inseparably connected with his honoured name. In 1845 she writes to him : " Our Lord carried me in spirit to the road to Calvary, and put before me a vivid picture of the pious service rendered Him by St. Veronica, when with her veil she wiped His Sacred Face all covered as it was with spitting, with dust, with sweat, and with blood. He made me understand that impious men renew at the present day by their blasphemies the outrages that were done to His Sacred Face, and I saw how all the blasphemies that they poured forth on the Divinity fell back like the spitting of the Jews on the Holy Face of our Lord, Who made Himself the victim of sinners. I also understood from our Lord that he who applied himself to the reparation of the blasphemies and insults offered Him, renders Him the same service as the pious Veronica, and is regarded by Him with the same look of love with which He looked upon her in His Passion."

This idea, followed by a number of similar revelations made to the same holy nun, gradually developed itself in the mind of M. Dupont. The reparation for the blasphemies uttered against the Divine Saviour united itself with another object—the reparation for the profanation of Sunday by servile labour. While he was turning the matter over in his mind, he had a present made him from Rome of one of the authentic copies of the Holy Veil. He had no sooner hung this up in his room amid other pious pictures than a sudden thought struck him : Shall I allow that Sacred Face to remain with no mark of honour paid to it ? And he thereupon lighted a lamp before it, and as it was a room in which he received visitors, he determined that all who came to see him should, after their business was over, either withdraw at once, or if they remained should converse only on heavenly things. A day or two after this a pious lady visited him who was suffering from some painful affliction of the eyes, and while she was praying before the Holy Face it came into his mind to say to her, " Rub your eyes with a little of the oil from the lamp." She did so, and to her astonishment all the pain in her eyes at once disappeared. This miracle was soon followed by many more : cancers, ulcers, cataracts, deafness, disappeared on the application of this holy oil, and within a couple of years M. Dupont had distributed more than eight thousand little bottles of oil.

From that time forward his life was one long career of work for God. Amid a continuous succession of well-authenticated

miracles which were rightly attributed to his sanctity as the means chosen by God through which to reveal His power, he remained humble, forgetful of self, devoted to the great work of reparation. "I live," he himself writes, "in that sort of confusion which must accompany those whom the world in general regards as instruments." Simple, unpretending, modest, prudent, he displayed that calm and peaceful happiness which is one of the characteristics of the saints, working from morn till night at the task which God had entrusted to him. As the fame of the miracles spread, he was flooded with correspondence. Letters came addressed sometimes : *Au grand mèdecin, or au Thaumaturge de Tours, or à celui qui guérit les hommes*. He was always annoyed by anything like personal homage and those who sought to win him by compliments were sadly disappointed. But we must refer our readers to M. Janvier's most interesting book for the account of his virtues and sufferings, of his love of God, and his devotion to the saints and the Holy Souls. He died the death of a saint, and many miracles have since then been performed at his tomb and by his intercession. Some day perhaps we may see him raised to the altars of the Church to further still more that sacred devotion to the Holy Face of our Lord which is becoming every day more widely spread and more fervently practised in many parts of the Catholic Church.

---

2. *Sermons on the Church of England and Dissent*, with Introduction by the late Dean of Westminster. London : Smith, Elder and Co.

These sermons are interesting as an indication of the ever-increasing comprehensiveness of the Church of England, which finds room within her all-embracing pale, on the one side for those who stretch out their hands to the Holy See, longing and praying for corporate re-union, and on the other for those who offer the grasp of friendly welcome to the various dissenting sects. The various clergymen who are contributors to this little volume are, it need not be said, of the Broad school of theology, no friends to dogmatism, caring little about discipline, ready to overlook such minor points as the presence or absence of a sacramental system, of bishops, creeds and formularies of faith. The general drift of the sermons is that every religious body bears testimony to important religious truth, and consequently that each of the various sects has contributed some valuable idea

obscured or overlooked or forgotten in Anglicanism. The Independents are the champions of religious liberty, the Baptists of the individual and personal relation of man to God, the Quakers of the immediate inspiration of each individual Christian, the Unitarians of free inquiry in matters of religion, the Presbyterians of the necessity of a confident trust in the perfect righteousness of Christ, and the Methodists of the necessity of a conversion of heart and of an assurance of predestination to eternal life. We might show, if our space permitted, how each of these sectarian tenets is a distortion of some Catholic truth unrecognized by Anglicanism. We must content ourselves with remarking that we agree with Dean Stanley in his opinion that the Church of England must be founded on some broader basis if she is to continue at all. The days of the old-fashioned orthodox Anglicanism are passed away for ever or relegated to country parishes where the disintegrating process has not yet made itself felt. We must confess that we regret, as Catholics, the change that is taking place. Many pious souls lived and died in all good faith, believing in their invincible ignorance that the Church of England was a perfect representative (as far as anything human can be perfect) of the pure doctrine of our Lord and His Apostles, and that the Church of Rome (of which they knew nothing) was full of corruptions and modern inventions. But it was impossible that this fond delusion could long continue, and the present generation of Anglican clergymen count among their numbers few indeed of the school of Keble or George Herbert or Bishop Ken. One by one their living representatives are disappearing from among us, and giving place to a variety of temper and opinion, which makes the internal strife more bitter day by day, and the other sects more bold in the assertion of their right to take a position of equality, if not of superiority, to the Anglican Establishment. Henceforward it must assume a more liberal and undogmatic position if it is to continue to exist at all, in its present state. The only question is, which of its various sections will prevail. The Ritualists we may put out of the question as insignificant in numbers and below the mark in intellectual power. Their admirable zeal and work among the poor will not help them much if it comes to a struggle for existence. The Evangelicals are fairly numerous, but have lost, to a great extent, their early fervour, and with one or two exceptions have but few representative men. The Broad Church are always liable to find the quasi-orthodox sections combined

against them as unbelievers. Probably the section which would carry the day would be the moderate High Church party. They would have the Bishops with them, and if it was a question of Disestablishment, they would find themselves supported by the great mass of the clergy, especially the country clergy, and by a large proportion of the landed gentry. It is for this reason that we believe that the time for the disruption of the Established Church is not very imminent, though come it must, sooner or later: probably through a combination of Ritualists within and Dissenters without, with whom a considerable number of Broad Churchmen will join hands. It may take place by the practical abolition of subscription, which will give the Unitarians, Independents, Baptists, and above all Wesleyans, the opportunity of improving their material and social position, or it may be directly voted by Parliament as a logical consequence of the breaking down of all religious barriers. Anyhow, we must expect in some years, more or less, the fulfilment of a prophecy which we remember Mr. Spurgeon to have embodied in a sermon on the appropriate text, "Take away her battlements, for they are not the Lord's." Already the intellect and sympathy of England is dissociated from Anglicanism. Dean Stanley is quite mistaken in saying that the Establishment is essentially the Church of the nation. Cardinal Manning has well observed in *The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost*, that no heresy has ever flourished much beyond its tercentenary. Anglicanism will be no exception to the law of death to which every corrupt form of religion is necessarily destined.

- 
3. *My Journey to Medinah.* By J. F. Keane (Hajj Mohammed Amin). Author of *Six Months in Mecca*. London: Tinsley Brothers.

In his brief Preface to the present work, Mr. Keane expresses his satisfaction at the favourable reception of his former book, *Six Months in Mecca*. All his readers will, we feel sure, be ready to rejoice with him, since he has thus been led to publish the account now before us of his pilgrimage to Medinah. Unlike too many writers who, on the strength of having written one amusing book, inflict upon the public a second which falls far short of its predecessor in attractiveness, Mr. Keane's latest performance is decidedly his best, and we find ourselves confronted by an *embarras de richesses* when we attempt to make an extract here and there from his entertaining pages.



The adventures he met with are numerous and startling; indeed, had he not been gifted with marvellous strength of constitution and unfailing courage and readiness of resource, he could never have escaped to tell them. We may mention, for instance, the nocturnal attempt upon his life so thrillingly related (pp. 46, 49), and the interesting episode in chapter v. of his almost miraculous recovery from the effects of a wound inflicted upon him by a revengeful Bedawin; this restoration to health having been accomplished without the aid of a more nourishing diet than was afforded by—watermelon!

The Bedawin character, as exhibited throughout these pages, cannot impress the reader otherwise than unfavourably, in spite of the author's protest that "there is really much in the desert man to admire." But facts speak for themselves, and show these wild tribes to be implacable in their hatred, much addicted to cruelty, cunning, rapacious; in a word, thorough-paced scoundrels. And the children do their best to be worthy imitators of the parental virtues, as Mr. Keane found to his cost upon one occasion, when he had the greatest difficulty in escaping from an unexpected and most determined onslaught made upon him whilst he was bathing, by a mere child who had armed himself with a knife and was evidently "on murderous thoughts intent." Mr. Keane has the gift of enlisting the sympathy of his readers whenever he wishes to do so: can anyone help feeling for Marabak, the unhappy camel whose end is so touchingly described? And must not everyone grieve for the gallant horse, so disastrously drowned through the sheer clumsiness and fatuous folly of the Arabs and negroes in charge of him? Again, who can be otherwise than interested in the charming story of the brave and handsome Hindi woman who, with her baby and two little children, encountered all the hardships of the five hundred miles' tramp over the desert in order to rejoin her husband settled at Medinah? The account is too long to be given in its entirety, but we must extract one paragraph, showing the happy conclusion of the praiseworthy undertaking.

"The little Hindi woman and her children came to me to give me a farewell. She looked 'in pitiful case'; but she was so happy at having reached the end of her journey, and at her prospects of soon meeting her husband, that she did not seem to be aware of the sore state of her feet and of her swollen legs. I borrowed a rupee from the third warrior and gave it her, and

he gave her half a rupee himself. I afterwards heard that she found her husband keeping a small tea-stall, and doing very well. He must have made a good deal out of our custom while we were in Medinah, for our people went to his stall regularly. I had no opportunity of seeing my little dark heroine again; but her bright brave face, during the whole of her terrible tramp, will always dwell in my memory. I never expect to meet with a better instance of the devotion of a wife and mother."

As a matter of course Mr. Keane could not share in the extravagant fanaticism of the devotees, but he gives us an admirable description of Medinah, and of the tomb of the Prophet, concluding in these words:

"I had just beheld a sight after seeing which hundreds of men have plucked out their eyes, so that they might never be used to look upon anything less worthy. The practice of some fanatics has been to take a red-hot brick, and holding it close to their faces, gaze on it till they roasted their eyes out. I felt tired and disappointed, that was all."

These people, he tells us, have in their language no word to express gratitude to a man, but refer to God every expression of thanks, because they regard every benefit, even the smallest, as coming directly from Him. A curious instance, certainly, of that element of truth to be found in all false religions, without which they could neither establish nor maintain their hold upon mankind.

There is a droll account of the manner in which Mr. Keane inadvertently aroused the *odium theologicum* of a worthy old gentleman by happening to mention the miracle of our Lord turning water into wine. The indignant Mahometan persisted that the wine was turned into water, and that Christians misrepresent the account of that miracle in order to reconcile their belief and their practice.

Now and then perhaps Mr. Keane is a little vulgar, and a trifle too realistic in some of his descriptions, but at all events, he is never dull, and has contrived to give us a great deal of information in a very pleasant manner; indeed, he is a master in the difficult art of combining instruction and amusement. Certainly he will grow tired of writing before we can be weary of reading what he writes, and we feel sure that no one who may get this entertaining book on our recommendation will feel disposed, as he lays it down, to quarrel with us for having induced him to peruse it.

4. *Cervantes*. By Mrs. Oliphant. Foreign Classics Series. William Blackwood and Sons, London and Edinburgh.

In the Introduction to this little book, whose 212 pages are but a limited space in which to record an eventful life, to depict a noble character, and to notice works of great literary fame, Mrs. Oliphant expresses her desire of giving the reader "some simple idea of the man and his work," and it is undeniable that she accomplishes her task most successfully. Instead of concluding the biographical sketch of Cervantes, and afterwards enumerating his principal contributions to literature, Mrs. Oliphant pauses from time to time, whilst following the course of his life, to glance at his different works at the period when they were written, thus adding to the interest of the reader by pointing out what external circumstances or state of mind led to their composition.

Miguel de Cervantes de Saavedra was born, in 1547, at Alcalá. His family was ancient and illustrious, but at that time greatly impoverished, as was the case with many noble Spanish houses, whose members lived in proud seclusion on their diminished estates. In the education of their children they thought less, we are told, of imparting instruction than of making them gentlemen, jealously fostering in them that chivalrous sense of honour and generous magnanimity which from time immemorial have been the heirloom of the Hidalgo. Cervantes acquired little learning, but early evinced a taste for reading; he began his career as a soldier, and took part in the Battle of Lepanto. On the morning of the battle he was sick of fever, but nothing could induce him to refrain from fighting, and fighting with desperate valour too; he had good reason to remember the victory, for the wounds he received prostrated him for months afterwards, and deprived him for life of the use of his left hand. After some six years more of military service, the struggle with the Turks being ended, Cervantes turned homewards, furnished with letters of recommendation from his generals to the King. On his way to his beloved country he was, in company with his brother, captured by the Moors, and the very papers which were to have made his fortune increased his misfortune, as they led his captors to consider him a gentleman of importance, to be valued at a high ransom. The family finances were insufficient, although the daughters' dowries were sacrificed for the purpose, to furnish

more than was required for the liberation of his brother, and for five years and a half Cervantes languished in bondage. During this time several attempts at escape were made by him and his fellow-slaves, but always without success, the discovery of the plot only making matters worse for the captives, although Cervantes generously endeavoured to avert all penalty from the others by declaring himself to be the sole conspirator. At length the requisite sum was raised, and Cervantes was free to return to Spain, glowing with bright hope and ardent expectation, eager to obtain the reward of his services and to awaken sympathy in the hearts of King and people for his oppressed countrymen in Algiers. Disappointment met him. Spain had no welcome for him, no ear for his tale of wrong and misery; he failed to obtain promotion for himself or succour for others; his father was dead, his family dispersed, and there was nothing left for him but to follow the army on some distant and inglorious campaign. About this time his first work was published, a pastoral poem, entitled *Galatea*, also the dramas of captivity, in which many scenes of his own life amongst the Moors are reproduced. The five years in Algiers seem to have left a lasting mark on him, since there is scarcely one of his novels or dramas, Mrs. Oliphant informs us, where there is not something to recall the remembrance of that time; even with his softest pastoral strain mingles the sigh of some exile; in the background of most pictures lurks the shadow of a Moorish prison; on almost every stage a confessor or a renegade has a part assigned him. Those painful years also taught him the great lesson of patience in adversity, and prepared him to encounter the disenchantments and disappointments in store for him during the remainder of his life. His character shows to great advantage under trial; though rest and recompense were denied him, though he met with neglect and inappreciation from his contemporaries, this did not produce bitterness or melancholy. Never does he indulge in self-pity or complaint at the hardships and humiliations of his existence, poor and laborious as this appears to have been. Ever cheerful and courageous, bright and mirthful, as if his dreams and hopes had been realised, he struggled on, with a cheery laugh at his own ill-fortune, or a good-tempered jest at the expense of those who caused it.

In 1584 he married and settled in Seville, where he obtained a small Government appointment; from this time he began to

write systematically, although apparently with small pecuniary profit to himself, for when his biographer, after temporarily losing sight of him, finds him again at Valladolid, some ten years later, he is living in most humble obscurity, the women of his household earning their bread by embroidering Court dresses, and Cervantes himself, without any settled employment, except that of composing the great work which was speedily to acquire a world-wide fame. All who have followed the adventures and misadventures of the knight of La Mancha, of which Mrs. Oliphant cleverly contrives to give a very good outline, must have been captivated by the delicious admixture of jest and pathos, of shrewd wisdom and quaint folly, of trenchant satire and magnanimous sentiment contained in the book, whose moral atmosphere is, moreover, pure from all taint, although some of the expressions employed are, as is the case with Shakespeare, more suited to the age for which they were written than for our own. Nevertheless the author whose book, greeted everywhere with enthusiastic acclamations, amused all Europe, seems himself to have been overlooked; his latter years were full of literary activity, but to the last his friends were few, his means scanty. When Cervantes felt his end approaching he hastened to put the last touches to the work on which he was engaged, *Persiles and Sigismunda*, and which he considered his best—an opinion none will be found to share with him. The dedication of it to his patron was written after he had received the last sacraments, and the shades of death were closing round him. He died at Madrid, at the age of sixty-nine, and was buried in the convent where his only child had taken the veil. Some years previous to his death he became a tertiary of St. Francis.

Mrs. Oliphant writes *con amore*, and exhibits throughout her enthusiastic admiration of Cervantes. We cannot help thinking she is somewhat bold in asserting in so unqualified a manner that "he is universally regarded as the first of Spanish writers, the representative in literature of that country, the finest flower of her genius," as if overlooking the fact that Calderon and Lope de Vega are his countrymen. But not content with claiming for him the first place in the realm of literature, she goes further, and declares her hero to be "Spain's greatest son," an opinion many would contest, seeing how numerous are the illustrious Spaniards whom history holds up to view.



5. *The Genesis of Evil* and other Sermons, mainly expository. By Samuel Cox.  
London : C. Kegan Paul and Co.

It is one of the signs of the times that some of the ablest Protestant sermons and religious books published of late have been produced by Nonconformist ministers. The quasi-theological education, the culture, and the learning, are now no longer the monopoly of Anglicanism. The once despised Dissenter is now able to push forward into the front ranks, and to overcome the difficulties that the absence of social position and intellectual training formerly entailed on men whose consciences did not allow them to sign the Thirty-Nine Articles, or to declare themselves adherents of the religion of the State. Mr. Cox's Sermons are the work of a well-informed and thoughtful Nonconformist. His illustrations are well chosen, his English is good, and his theology is not more at variance from truth than might be expected from one who has no guide to save him from mistaking theory for fact, and to teach him with the voice of Divine Authority. He puts his thoughts in an interesting and picturesque form, knows his Bible well, and leaves a good impression of his personal character. In treating of the origin of evil he does not go to the bottom of the difficulty. He is a believer in the final restitution of all things, and, as the natural result of this, in explaining conversion he does not allow that any living man is either the friend or the enemy of God. He keeps well out of sight the terrors of God's judgments, and puts forward the pleasant side of religion in a way that obscures, if it does not altogether obliterate, the foulness of sin, its hatefulness in the sight of God, and its terrible and disastrous consequences. This pleasant and easy creed, so comfortable to the sinner, is unfortunately spreading more and more amid educated Protestants, and we regret to think that Mr. Cox's Sermons, containing as they do so much that is excellent, tend to confirm the deadly heresy that there is no difference of kind between saint and sinner, but only a difference of degree, and that the sufferings of those who die without an act of true contrition are not eternal but only "æonian." Such opinions as these, under pretence of mercy, are rife with cruelty to the sinner. They inspire him with a false confidence, and presumptuous reliance on that mercy which is indeed incredible and unfathomable, but requires on the part of the sinner conditions that Mr. Cox wholly ignores.

6. *Fair Athens.* By E. M. Edmonds. London : Remington and Co.

Of all those whom the magic name of Athens, inscribed upon its title-page, may induce to read the commencement of this interesting book, no one will, we think, be disposed to lay it aside without completing its perusal. Yet we must be allowed to express our conviction that much more might have been made of such abundant materials as the author, or more properly speaking the *authoress*, had at hand. The evidence as to the sex of the writer is indeed sufficiently conflicting, for we find this mysterious individual addressed as "Monsieur" in an early page, then, on page 204, we are told of some one who "was rather bewildered to see a foreigner—a *woman*—and alone." But this is a very trifling matter, and in no way lessens the value or attractiveness of the work before us, in the pages of which we find such a happy blending of the old and the new, such a constant change from grave to gay, such continual variety of matter, that our attention is never suffered to flag.

There is an interesting explanation of the reason why Athens so many ages ago received the epithet "violet-crowned," the slopes of Hymettus appearing no less purple at a season when neither violets nor thyme could be blooming, so that the beautiful colour must be due to atmospheric causes alone, especially as the mountain, when seen close, looks no longer purple, but grey. The history of the Professor in whose house the writer was domiciled is typical of the career of many young Greeks who have attained eminence in their several professions; and we extract it, not for its own sake alone, but because it shows what energy and perseverance must still be found even in the "degenerate" Greek. "It is an event of almost daily occurrence for young men to come from the outlying parts of Greece to Athens for the sole purpose of acquiring the education which is offered by the Universities free of charge. For this purpose they hire themselves out as servants, with the proviso they shall be allowed to attend certain classes and lectures. There are always great facilities to enable them to attain what they desire. Every family must have a man-servant, for it is not the custom for even the poorest girl to go out alone. Professor Kerasos was a native of Macedonia, a country still unhappily under the Turkish rule, which presses heavily upon its inhabitants. He left his home alone, at the early age of twelve, and came to Athens to seek his fortune. By different

small services, which sufficed to procure him food and clothing, he got the primary education he longed for. Advancing step by step, with ardent and steadfast purpose, he passed successfully through the different gradations, ever higher and higher, studying and serving, denying himself all superfluities, and economizing his savings until he had saved a sufficiency to enable him to go to Leipsic. There he remained for three years, addressing himself closely to the study of the German language. . . . After having secured his education and chosen his path in life, the next thing a Greek strives for is to buy or build for himself a house. Returning from Leipsic, and obtaining a post in the University at Athens, Kūrios Kerasos married; the next thing was to achieve the much-coveted acquisition—a house of his own; this he also obtained, and the stone, well-built house at the foot of Lycabettus where I found myself domiciled, was the freehold property of the Professor, built under his own eye and to suit his particular requirements."

Our space forbids us to quote many amusing details of domestic life under the Professor's roof, yet we cannot do otherwise than remark in passing for the consolation of sorely tried masters and mistresses that, judging from what we read in the pages before us, servants seem to be even worse in Athens than they are amongst ourselves: more wayward, more independent, more intolerant of control.

In the description given us of the Easter ceremonial, there is much which must be familiar to a large majority of English readers; the account of the manner in which each household, however poor, aims to have a lamb roasted whole, is not only striking in itself, but curious as illustrating "the strong Hebraistic feeling so conspicuous in many of their customs and observances, and particularly obvious at Easter" (p. 148).

The following passage shows the force of our Lord's comparison of the sheep and the goats at the judgment. After a description of the manner in which, upon the mountains, sheep know and obey the voice of the shepherd, the authoress adds:

"As I witnessed the different behaviour of the goats, I could well understand why they are placed on the left hand. For them to obey the call of the herdsman is quite out of the question, unless it accords with their own plans; they may, just at that particular moment, choose to pursue quite a contrary direction. Regardless of all exhortations, they wander and disperse at will, squabble and fight, and then perhaps suddenly

dash off at full speed, heedless alike of every obstacle and remonstrance, and leave the goatherd to *follow them*" (p. 123).

Our authoress was, she tells us, at last driven away from Athens by the heat; her stay there appears to have been most enjoyable, and we may hope that she accomplished the twofold purpose of her journey, namely, the acquisition of health and also of the Greek language. She certainly displays an amount of classical knowledge unfortunately not often met with in a lady; but we may be pardoned for reminding her that she might profitably devote a portion of her time to the study of her mother-tongue, since her style leaves much to be desired, being slipshod throughout and occasionally incorrect. For instance: "The old Christian churches in Athens, of which there *remains* but five" (p. 52); "we had declined to be accompanied with *these* greatest of all possible nuisances—a guide" (p. 180). In the concluding chapter, entitled "Sketch of Progress," we read to our surprise that one of the best of modern Greek poets considers it desirable that Shakespeare should be "placed before the Greek mind as the one model to which it should look up, both as regards dramatic art and poetry" (p. 307). The compliment is a great one, and it seems out of place in the mouth of a man who needs only to glance over the brilliant list of authors belonging to his native land to find more than one surpassing master alike of dramatic art and of the lyric poetry. Nor can we sympathize with the conviction expressed by the authoress herself that "the process of Anglicizing would tend to accelerate the progress of Greece as a kingdom and people." If the Greeks think so themselves and act on the belief, they will be disappointed in the end, and find the case of their theory to be identical with that of the violet-hued Hymettus, since in both instances alike "'tis distance lends enchantment to the view." Greece may have much to learn of England, but nothing but a mistaken though pardonable patriotism would make the authoress desire unreservedly that Greece should adopt *en masse* that strange mixture of good and evil which makes up the civilization of England.

---

7. *Lay Sermons.* By J. S. Blackie, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh. London: Macmillan and Co.

*Chacun à son métier* is an excellent maxim, and one which Mr. Blackie would do well to remember. A distinguished but eccentric Greek scholar, he is an eccentric but not a distinguished

theologian. He apologizes in the Preface for taking up theological subjects, on the ground of his having been "educated for the Church," and having "habitually prosecuted the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues." We are glad that he had the good sense in his earlier days to turn aside from a profession for which the present volume proves clearly enough that he had no vocation. His study of Holy Scripture in the original tongues may have been to him a "fruitful field of scholarly activity," but it certainly has done very little towards enabling him to understand the meaning of the sacred writers. He is deeply dyed in the true spirit of Scottish Protestant dogmatism, which consists in a blind adherence to one's own opinion and a total inability to understand the difficulties of those who disagree with you. The result is—though we say it with bated breath—that our good Professor often talks downright nonsense. In the chapter on Faith, he adduces as a modern example of that heroic virtue—*credite posteri!*—Victor Emmanuel. He apologizes indeed for certain private failings in his hero, by adducing Solomon and King David as having been prone to similar weaknesses; but in his public capacity he exalts the poor King of Sardinia to a high pinnacle of noble faith, comparing him to Moses, and describing him as "the redeemer of Italy from the iron hoof of a foreign despotism and from the nightmare of a secular priestcraft" (p. 134). He very much prefers the heathen mysteries of Eleusis to the Christian mysteries, the Divine Sacrifice of the Altar. His appreciation of the one and the other we learn from the following passages:

At Eleusis a reverence for the Divine mystery of life, whether as visibly displayed before us in the processes of vegetation and generation, or as prophetically indicated in the solemn mystery of death, viewed as the passage from a lower to a higher life, was worked into the soul by the contemplation of the legendary history of Demeter, Mother Earth, or the Divine mother: and this reverence, in the case of a moral being like man, naturally connected itself with the possession of a certain moral purity, which rendered exclusion from the mysteries the natural penalty of an immoral and a vicious life. In this way the hierophant at Eleusis, if he was no mere worldling, but deeply conscious of the divine significance of the rites he administered, might justly take into his mouth the words with which the Hebrew Psalmist has expressed the character of a worthy worshipper in the Holy Hill at Jerusalem: "Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord," &c. (p. 305).

And on the other hand—

The baptismal regeneration which the High Church Anglican clergy have juggled out of the simple symbolism of water as significant of



moral purity, is in its nature not a whit less repugnant to reason, or rather to common sense, than the mumbo-jumbo of transubstantiation with which the Romanists have so befooled religion and strangled reason in the Mass. . . . To all these varieties of faith in the outward symbol, as a thing apart from the virtue which it symbolizes, St. Paul would certainly have replied as to those Judaizing Christians: "In Christ Jesus there is neither baptismal regeneration, nor dipping, nor plunging, nor any such fashion of outward purification, but a new creature" (pp. 312, 313).

It is sad to read such rubbish as this from the pen of a distinguished man, or to see what fatal effects are produced on the intelligence of a scholar and a man of talent by narrow prejudice and ignorant misconceptions. But we must not be hard on our poor Professor. When the red rag of Popery, and what he calls "sectarian shibboleths," is not dangled in his face, he is often sensible enough. It is wonderful to find a Scotch Protestant advocating as suitable employments for the Sunday, music and sketching in the country, easy social gatherings among friends, and healthy games such as croquet, lawn-tennis, golf, and boating (p. 109). On the utilization and origin of evil he has some remarks of sterling excellence. "We are to rejoice in difficulties," he says, p. 163, "as the grand training school of a hardy and vigorous manhood. . . . A gardener who should puzzle his brain about the origin of weeds, instead of taxing his muscle to pull them out, would be justly laughed at; but we are all gardeners, each in his several corner of the Lord's vineyard." In another chapter he advocates the dignity of labour with telling force, and discusses the politics of Christianity with thoughtful analysis, except where the bug-bear of sacerdotalism frightens him. Once or twice we regret to say that Professor Blackie ventures rashly into verse, and we cannot refrain from quoting the following lines on Archbishop Sharp for the amusement of our readers.

And thou didst come, a cassocked slave,  
With windy proclamation,  
Parchment and ink and wax, to brave  
The spirit of a nation;

And with rash plume didst brush the flame,  
And wert consumed, poor fly!—  
So perish all who join the name  
Of Christ with tyranny!

Professor Blackie may have a scholarly, but he certainly has not a poetic soul!

8. *The Hindoos as they are.* By Shib Chunder Perse. With a Prefatory Note by Rev. W. Hastie, B.D. London, Stanford; Calcutta, Newman.

This is not a pleasant or an interesting book. It is a picture, and we fear a truthful one, of Hindoo society in Bengal, and the impression that it makes upon us is one of shame and sorrow at thinking what India might have been and what it is, what India might have been if England had been a Catholic nation, and had used her power and influence to Christianize the poor, ignorant, simple natives, with their inborn spirit of reverence and their affectionate devotion to all who are their friends: what India is, after the centuries during which we have governed (or rather misgoverned) her, forcing upon her a civilization without religion and an education without God. It is needless to say that the efforts of the Protestant missionaries—many of them good and zealous men—have been a ludicrous failure, and though some of the “emancipated” natives have found it worth their while to throw in their lot with the religion of the dominant class, yet they have made no impression, except a negative one, either on the educated or uneducated classes. The author of this book is one of these emancipated natives, “an enlightened Bengali of matured conviction and character” (says the Rev. Mr. Hastie in a preliminary note), who worships everything English, and consequently has no objection to take the English God into the bargain. We suppose that he calls himself a Christian, if we may judge from the scraps of the New Testament which he (or Mr. Hastie for him) has scattered over his pages; though we must confess that there is not much of the Christian spirit in him, and his Christianity seems to consist principally in denouncing the heathen festivals, marriage customs, and social institutions of the Hindoos, and that often with details, true enough perhaps, but very undesirable in a book intended for general circulation. Still there is a good deal of valuable information scattered up and down, and some curious illustrations of Hindoo life. For instance:

“When a *Ghatkee* (professional matchmaker) comes with the proposal of a matrimonial alliance with an educated youth, the first question generally asked her is, ‘Has he passed his examinations?’ If so, how many *passes* has he got? meaning thereby how many examinations of the University has he passed through? ‘Has he got any *Jalpany* or scholarship?’

These are difficult questions which must be satisfactorily answered before a negotiation can be effected. That a University degree has raised the marriageable value of a boy there can be no doubt. If he has successfully passed some of these examinations and got a scholarship, his parents naturally priding themselves on their valuable acquisition, demand a preposterously long catalogue of gold ornaments, which it is not in the power of a family in middling circumstances easily to bestow" (p. 44).

There are also several chapters on the religious festivals, which show clearly enough what agency is at work in their idolatrous worship. From a description of the consecration of the image of the goddess Doorga, we learn that the Hindoos, like most nations civilized or uncivilized, do not worship the image but the spirit of the goddess which is supposed to dwell in the image, for at the beginning of the festival the priest offers the following prayer: "Oh, goddess, come and dwell in this image and bless him who worships you." After this he touches with the two forefingers of his right hand the forehead, cheeks, eyes, and heart of the image, repeating all the while the prescribed incantation: "May the soul of Doorga long continue to dwell in this image." When we read all that takes place at the festival, there is no doubt to what class of spirits the spirit of the goddess Doorga belongs. We imagine that a Catholic missionary about to labour among the Hindoos might find this book a useful one, but we do not recommend it to the general reader.

- 
9. *Everyday Life in our Public Schools.* Edited by C. E. Pascoe. Griffith, Farran, and Co.

The public schools of England are institutions of which Englishmen are in many ways justly proud, and books enough and to spare have been of late written in description of their divers manners and customs. *Our Public Schools* published about a year since by Kegan Paul and Co. dwelt a good deal on their weak points, and in some cases was manifestly tainted by personal ill-feeling. The present volume attempts no criticism, and is partly historical, partly descriptive; the former portion being the work of the editor, the latter of those who have been, not so many years since, leading boys at one or other of them, and who write *con amore* respecting the *alma mater*

to which they owe their early training. Public school men will read with interest at least the part that concerns their own school, but to the outsider the details of daily life, at a place of which he knows nothing, are not attractive, and the literary power of the book is not sufficient to render these detailed descriptions amusing. We must, however, except Mr. T. R. Oliphant's account of "Life at Eton," which hits off admirably the leading traits of little Etonians. His description of the attitude of oppidans (or boys not on the foundation) towards collegers (or foundation-boys) is most life-like. Speaking of the "new boy," he says (p. 39):

"Various ideas get rooted in his mind, of which the chief are instinctive enmity to the masters with whom he has to do, and, in fact, to masters generally, and a profound aversion to collegers, especially those of about his own standing in the school. College is to the small oppidan an unknown and mysterious land, which he regards with mingled feelings of awe and contempt. A college magnate is, of course, not to be regarded with the same reverence to be accorded an oppidan in the eleven or the eight; but there are dark and mysterious stories of the power of college, and the way in which it is there wielded, which fill his youthful mind with terror. As he gets higher up in the school, however, most of these ideas wear out. He begins to think that a 'colleger' need not be such a bad fellow after all; that the master in whose division he is, is not a malignant tyrant, continually laying traps to get him punished; while as he begins to emulate his former idols in athletics, his veneration for them gradually lessens."

As we pass on from Eton to Harrow, Winchester, Shrewsbury, &c. we must confess that the information given in many cases throws no light on the character and spirit of the school, and is of no general interest to the public. What on earth is the object of telling the reader that at Charterhouse "any cake is called a 'he,' but a cold plum pudding of a more 'stodgy' nature is termed a 'she.' A 'cheesy' catch or kick needs no explanation here. A bath is called 'tosh;' cheese often 'tosh-soap.' The lavatory in each house is called 'cocks,' from the taps over the basins' (p. 244).

This is really puerile. Unfortunately there is a good deal of such schoolboy twaddle in the book, which also has the additional disadvantage of a want of uniformity, always the result of the combined work of a number of different hands.

What may have furnished material for a series of interesting articles in the *Leisure Hour*, does not at all, as a matter of course, furnish material for an interesting volume.

---

10. *Norsk Lapp and Finn.* By Frank Vincent, jun. London: Sampson and Low.

If any one wants to read a pleasant and chatty account of Norway, Sweden, and Lapland, he will find what he seeks in Mr. Vincent's volume of travel. A good deal of it reads like a guide-book, and is rather ordinary, but there is plenty of useful information pleasantly given, and the book is essentially what we express by the barbarous adjective "readable." It is beautifully printed, and the paper is excellent. We are told in an unpretending, matter of fact sort of way, the impression made upon an intelligent, educated American gentleman by the countries he visits and the people he meets, and this must always be attractive. The account of the Lapps, their reindeer, and their gradual disappearance in the face of advancing civilization, is specially interesting, and we can answer in the affirmative the question to which the author professes himself unable to reply—whether he has succeeded in transmitting his impressions in a desirable form to the public.

---

11. *First Confession Catechism.* Dublin: Gill and Son.

The importance of careful training in the early confessions of childhood can scarcely be overrated. How often a long series of bad confessions has been the result of some false or exaggerated doctrine inculcated on the young or timid by those who are ignorant of theology, and think to be on the safe side by their severity! How many a poor child has invented sins for itself through lack of sound and judicious instruction! It is then a work of real charity to aid the little ones who are so dear to the Heart of their Divine Master to begin life with sound principles and with a well instructed conscience; and we welcome this clear, simple, practical catechism, and hope to see it in the hands of every priest for the benefit of his little penitents, and of every master and mistress who has to prepare children for their first confession. It is judiciously worded and wisely discreet in dealing with the Sixth Commandment. It is nicely got up, the words and expressions are such as every child will understand, and it costs only a penny.



ng  
of

ow.

of

in

e a

of

lly

is

in

ion

the

ust

eer,

ili-

na-

e to

ons

s of

ries

ger-

are

their

tsself

en a

the

ples

this

ands

very

first

t in

, the

and,